



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 41] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, अक्टूबर 12, 1974/अश्विन 20, 1896
No. 41] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1974/ASVINA 20, 1896

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह छलम संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate paging is given to this part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—अध्याय 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्य क्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़कर)
केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities
(other than the Administrations of Union Territories)

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 31 अगस्त, 1974

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA
ORDER

New Delhi, the 31st August, 1974

क्र० प्र० 2667 —यत, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के निर्वाचन के लिए 130-उदयपुर निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री नियाकत हुसैन नया शराफा बाजार, उदयपुर, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बहाल गये नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित रीति में अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं।

और, यत, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रस्ताव स्वीकार नहीं किया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायाचार्य नहीं है,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री नियाकत हुसैन का मतदाता के किसी भी सदन का या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद या संसद चुन जाने और हटाने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

S.O. 2667.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Liyakat Hussain, R/o Naya Sarafa Bazar, Udaipur, Rajasthan, a contesting candidate for General Election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in March, 1972 from 130 Udaipur Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the rules made thereunder

2 And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure

3 Now therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Liyakat Hussain to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order

[सं० राज० वि० सं०/130/72(40)]

[No RJ-LA/130/72(40)]

नई दिल्ली, 5 सितम्बर, 1974

का०प्रा० 2668—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के निर्वाचन के लिए 38-किशनपोल सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार डा० रमेश चन्द्र शक्ति चिकित्सा केन्द्र, चांदपोल बाजार, जियालास मुंशी का रास्ता, जयपुर शहर, राजस्थान लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं,

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्बन्ध सूचनाएँ दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रस्तुत नहीं किया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त डा० रमेश चन्द्र, को समझ के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[स० राज०वि०स०/38/72(41)]

New Delhi, the 5th September, 1974

S.O. 2668.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Dr. Ramesh Chander, Shakti Chikitsa Kendir, Chandpole Bazar Jia Lal Munshi Ka Rasta, Jaipur City, Rajasthan, a contesting candidate for General Election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in March, 1972 from 38-Kishanpole Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the rules made thereunder;

2. And, whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Dr. Ramesh Chander to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/38/72(41)]

का०प्रा० 2669—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 को हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए निर्वाचन के लिए 65-नववाई निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री टीकम सुपुल श्री बुध्दा ग्राम व पो० मिसकपुर, तहसील बयाना जिला भरतपुर राजस्थान लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्बन्ध सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रस्तुत नहीं दिया है, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

यतः, अब, अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री टीकम को समझ के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[स० राज०वि०स०/65/72(42)]

S.O. 2669.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Tikam s/o Shri Budha, Village and Post Office Milakpur Tehsil Boysana, District Bharatpur, Rajasthan a contesting candidate for General Election to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly held in March, 1972 from 65-Nadhai Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder:

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification or such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Tikam to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/65/72(42)]

नई दिल्ली, 19 सितम्बर, 1974

का०प्रा० 2670.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1950 की धारा 13क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निर्वाचन आयोग दादरा तथा नागर हवेली सघ राज्य क्षेत्र के प्रशासन के परामर्श से, श्री अनिल चोपड़ा, कलेक्टर, दादरा तथा नागर हवेली को तारीख 6 जुलाई, 1974 के अवसर से श्री जगदीश सागर के स्थान पर, दादरा तथा नागर हवेली सघ राज्य क्षेत्र के लिए मुख्य निर्वाचन अधिकारी के रूप में एतद्वारा नाम निर्देशित करता है।

[स० 154/दा०न०ह०/74]

New Delhi, the 19th September, 1974

S.O. 2670.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950, the Election Commission, in consultation with the Administration of the Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, hereby nominates Shri Anil Chopra, Collector, Dadra and Nagar Haveli as the Chief Electoral Officer for the Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli with effect from the afternoon of the 6th July, 1974 vice Shri Jagdish Sagar.

[No. 154/DNH/74]

आदेश

का०प्रा० 2671.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि अप्रैल, 1972 में हुए मिजोरम विधान सभा के निर्वाचन के सिधे 9-हजार घियास सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री सांगबुगा जोबावक, बी० पी० प्रो० जोबावक, मिजोरम, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951

तथा तदधीन बनाये गये नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित समय के अन्दर तथा रीति में अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं।

और, यत, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्बन्ध सूचनायें दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण प्रथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिये कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री सांगचुंगा को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिये इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष के लिये निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० मिजो०-वि० सं०/9/72]

ORDER

S.O. 2671.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sangchunga, Zobawk, B.P.O. Zobawk, Mizoram, a contesting candidate for the general election held in April, 1972, to the Mizoram Legislative Assembly from 9-Hnahthial constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses within the time and in the manner required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Sangchunga to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a state for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MIZ-LA/9/72]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 25 सितम्बर, 1974

का० आ० 2672.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1950 (1950 का 43) की धारा 13ख की उपधारा (1) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में और अपनी अधिसूचना सं० 429/अ० नि०/द्वी० सं०/71(1), तारीख 17 जनवरी, 1974 को प्रतिष्ठित करने हुये, निर्वाचन आयोग, अद्यतन और निकोबार द्वीप समूह संघ राज्यक्षेत्र की सरकार के परामर्श से श्री एस० के० पाल खजाना अधिकारी, अद्यतन और निकोबार द्वीप समूह पोर्ट ब्लेयर, को तारीख 23 जुलाई, 1974 से अद्यतन और निकोबार द्वीप समूह समुद्रीय निर्वाचन क्षेत्र के लिये निर्वाचक रजिस्ट्रीकरण अधिकारी के रूप में एतद्वारा पदाभिहित करता है।

[सं० 429/अ० नि० द्वीप समूह/71(1)]

श्री० नागसुब्रमण्यन, सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 25th September, 1974

S.O. 2672.—In pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 13B of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950), and in supersession of its notification No. 429/A&N/71(1), dated 17 January, 1974, the Election Commission hereby designates, in consultation with the Government of Union Territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Shri S. K. Paul, Treasury Officer, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Port Blair, as the Electoral Registration Officer for the Andaman and Nicobar Island Parliamentary Constituency with effect from 23rd July, 1974.

[No. 429/A&N/71(1)]
V. NAGASUBRAMANIAN, Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 24 सितम्बर, 1974

का० आ० 2673.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1950 (1950 का 43) की धारा 13क उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये निर्वाचन आयोग बिहार सरकार के परामर्श से, श्री जे० जी० कुन्टे को उनके कार्यभार सभालने की तारीख से अगले आदेशों तक श्री यू० एन० राय के स्थान पर बिहार सरकार के लिये मुख्य निर्वाचन अधिकारी के रूप में एतद्वारा नाम निर्देशित करता है।

[सं० 154/बिहार/74]

ए० एन० सैन, सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 24th September, 1974

S.O. 2673.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950), the Election Commission of India, in consultation with the Government of Bihar, hereby nominates Shri J. G. Kunte, as the Chief Electoral Officer for the State of Bihar, with effect from the date he takes over charge and until further orders vice Shri U. N. Rai.

[No. 154/BR/74]

A. N. SEN, Secy.

विधि, न्याय और कम्पनी कार्य मन्त्रालय

(न्याय विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 1974

का० आ० 2674.—न्यायालय अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 70) की धारा 15 की उपधारा (2) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, इसके द्वारा, सश शांतिन क्षेत्र चण्डीगढ़ से संबंधित, उक्त उपधारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए चण्डीगढ़ प्रशासन विधि-परामर्शी को विधि-अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० 30/13/74-न्याय]

एम० सी० नारंग, अवसर सचिव

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE & COMPANY AFFAIRS

(Department of Justice)

New Delhi, the 30th September, 1974

S.O. 2674.—In pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 15 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 (70 of 1971), the Central Government hereby specifies the Legal Remembrancer, Chandigarh Administration to be the Law Officer for the purposes of the said sub-section, in relation to the Union Territory of Chandigarh.

[No. 30/13/74-Jus.]

M. C. NARANG, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर 1974

का० आ० 2675.—एकाधिकार एवं निर्बन्धनकारी व्यापार प्रथा अधिनियम, 1969 (1969 का 54) की धारा 26 की उप-धारा (3) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निम्नांकित उपक्रमों के अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत पञ्जीकरणों के निरस्तीकरण को अधिसूचित करती है।

1. सै० गयाजी मिल्स लि०

(पञ्जीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र संख्या 689/71, दिनांक 2-1-1971)

2. मै० एण्डस्ट्रिक्स मशीनरी मैन्युफैक्चरर्स प्रा० लि०
(पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र संख्या 690/71, दिनांक 4-1-1971)
3. मै० सी डाक्टर एण्ड कम्पनी प्रा० लि०
(पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र संख्या 691/71, दिनांक 6-1-1971)
4. मै० ओरियन्टल कारपोरेशन प्रा० लि०
(पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र संख्या 749/71, दिनांक 17-6-1971)
5. मै० महुता मशीनरी मैन्युफैक्चरर्स प्रा० लि०
(पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र संख्या 778/71, दिनांक 28-10-1971)
6. मै० श्री शुभलक्ष्मी मिल्स लि०
(पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र संख्या 752/71, दिनांक 7-7-1971)

[संख्या 2/14/73-एम० 2]

कान्त मणि शर्मा, अवसर सचिव

S.O. 2675.—In pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 26 of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 (54 of 1969), the Central Government hereby notifies the cancellation of the registration of the following undertakings under the said Act :—

1. M/s. Sayaji Mills. Ltd.
(Certificate of Registration No. 689/71, dated 2nd January, 1971).
2. M/s. Industrial Machinery Manufacturers Pvt Ltd.
(Certificate of registration No. 690/71 dated the 4-1-71).
3. M/s. C. Doctore & Co. Pvt. Ltd.
(Certificate of registration No. 691/71 dated the 6th January, 1971).
4. M/s. Oriental Corporation Pvt. Ltd.
(Certificate of registration No. 749/71 dated 17th June, 1971).
5. M/s. Mehta Machinery Manufacturers Pvt. Ltd.,
(Certificate of registration No. 778/71 dated the 28th October, 1971).
6. M/s. Shree Subhalaskhmi and Mills Ltd.
(Certificate of registration No. 752/71 dated 7-7-1971)
[No. 2/14/73-M II]
K. M. SHARMA, Under Secy.

वित्त मन्त्रालय

(राजस्व और बीमा विभाग)

सीमा-शुल्क

नई दिल्ली, 12-10-1974

क्र० प्रा० 2676.—सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 160 की उपधारा (3) के साथ पठित धारा 7 के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व केन्द्रीय राजस्व बोर्ड की अधिसूचना क्र० 28-सीमा शुल्क, तारीख 2 अप्रैल, 1960 से निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् —

उक्त अधिसूचना से उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में, क्रम सं० 3 के सामने तीसरे स्तम्भ में आए "करैकल" शब्द का लोप कर दिया जाएगा।

[सं० 574/6/74-एम० सी II]

डी० स्वरूप, अवसर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE & INSURANCE)

CUSTOMS

New Delhi, the 12th October, 1974

S.O. 2676.—In exercise of the power conferred by clause (a) of section 7 read with sub-section (3) of section 160 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962) the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment to the notification of the Government of India in the late Central Board of Revenue No 28-Customs, dated the 2nd April, 1960 namely :—

In the Scheduled annexed to the said notification, the word "Karaikal" appearing in the third column against S. No. 3 shall be omitted.

[F. No 574/6/74-LCII]

D. SARUP, Under Secy.

नियंत्रक

नई दिल्ली, 21 मितम्बर, 1974

क्र० प्रा० 2677.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 194-क की उपधारा 3 के खण्ड (iii) के उपखण्ड (ब) के अनुमरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार केरल स्टेट टेक्सटाइल कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड, कोचीन को उक्त उपखण्ड के प्रयोजनों के लिये अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं० 718 (फा० सं० 275/6/74-आई टी जे)]

के० धार० राघवन, उप सचिव

Income-tax

New Delhi, the 21st September, 1974

S.O. 2677.—In pursuance of sub-clause (f) of clause (iii) of sub-section 3 of Section 194-A of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) the Central Government hereby notifies the Kerala State Textiles Corporation Ltd., Cochin for the purposes of the said sub-clause.

[No. 718 (F. No. 275/6/74-ITJ)]

K. R. RAGHAVAN, Dy. Secy.

ग्रावेण

नई दिल्ली, 23 अगस्त, 1974

क्र० प्रा० 2678.—धनकर अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 27) की धारा 12 क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट व्यक्ति को उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (3) में की तत्संबंधी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट पदनाम के साथ मूल्यांकन अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

सारणी

क्र० सं०	व्यक्ति का नाम	पदनाम
1	2	3
1	श्री बाई० पी० डी० कपूर	मूल्यांकन अधिकारी (सयत्र और मशीनरी)

[सं० 72/74/फा० सं० 328/160/74-धन कर]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd August, 1974

S.O. 2678.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of section 12A of the Wealth-tax Act, 1957 (27 of 1957), the Central Government hereby appoints the person specified in column (2) of the Table below as Valuation Officer with the designation specified in the corresponding entry in column (3) of the said Table:

TABLE

S. No.	Name of the person	Designation
1	2	3
1.	Shri Y. P. D. Kapur	Valuation Officer (plant machinery)

[No. 72/74/F. No. 328/160/74-W.T.]

भावेन

नई दिल्ली, 7 सितम्बर, 1974

का० प्रा० 2679.—घन-कर अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 27) की धारा 12-क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट व्यक्तियों को, उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (3) में दी गई तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट पदनामों सहित, मूल्यांकन अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है:

सारणी

क्रम सं०	व्यक्ति का नाम	पदनाम
1.	श्री बी० ए० सत्यनारायण	मूल्यांकन अधिकारी
2.	श्री पी० जे० चैतानी	मूल्यांकन अधिकारी

[सं० 78/का० सं० 328/194/74-इस्यू० टी०]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 7th September, 1974

S.O. 2679.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 12A of the Wealth-tax Act, 1957 (27 of 1957), the Central Government hereby appoints the persons specified in column (2) of the Table below as Valuation Officers with the designations specified in the corresponding entry in column (3) of the said Table:

TABLE

S. No.	Name of the person	Designation
1.	Shri B. A. Satyanarayana	Valuation Officer
2.	Shri P. J. Chainani	Valuation Officer

[No. 78/F. No. 328/194/74-W.T.]

नई दिल्ली, 16 अगस्त, 1974

गुडि-पस

का० प्रा० 2680.—घन-कर. केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष-कर बोर्ड निवेश देता है कि उनके आदेश सं० 60, तारीख 22-7-74 (का०

सं० 328/137/74—घन-कर) में संलग्न सारणी के क्रम सं० 14 के सामने स्तम्भ 3 में की प्रविष्टि को निम्न प्रकार पढ़ा जाएगा—

“महायुक्त आय-कर आयुक्त (निरीक्षण), अर्जुन रेंज, चण्डीगढ़।”

[सं० 70/1974 का० सं० 328/137/74 इस्यू० टी०]

बी० डी० बखारकर, प्रभार सचिव

New Delhi, the 16th August, 1974

CORRIGENDUM

S.O. 2680.—The Central Board of Direct Taxes direct that the entry in Column 3 against S. No. 14 in the table appended to their order No. 60, dated 22-7-74 (F. No. 328/137/74-W.T.) be, read as:—

“Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, acquisition range, Chandigarh.”

[No. 70/1974 F. No. 328/137/74-W.T.]

V. D. WAKHARKAR, Under Secy.

केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

(आय-कर)

नई दिल्ली, 23 मई, 1974

का० प्रा० 2681.—आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, समय-समय पर यथासंशोधित अपनी अधिसूचना संख्या 20 (का० सं० 55/1/62—आई० टी०), तारीख 30 अप्रैल, 1963 से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है:—

क्रम सं० 9-ब, मद्रास II के सामने, उससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 3 के नीचे, निम्नलिखित जोड़ा जायेगा:

“28 करूर मकिल (सभी अनुभाग)”

यह अधिसूचना 1 जून, 1974 को प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 630 (का० सं० 191/11/74 आई० टी० (ए० आई०))]

बी० बी० श्रीनिवासन्, प्रभार सचिव

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

(Income-tax)

New Delhi, the 23rd May, 1974

S.O. 2681.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendments to the Schedule appended to its Notification No. 20 (F. No. 55/1/62-IT) dated the 30th April, 1963, as amended from time to time:

Against S. No. 9-B, Madras-II, under Column 3 of the Schedule appended thereto, the following shall be added:

“28. Karur Circle (all sections).”

This notification shall come into force on 1st June, 1974.

[No. 630 (F. No. 191/11/74-IT(AI))]

V. B. SRINIVASAN, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 1 अक्टूबर, 1974

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 1974

का० प्रा० 2682.—संपदा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1953 (1953 का 34) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (2) के द्वितीय पन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड निदेश देता है कि उनका आदेश सं० 59 (फा० सं० 301/68/74—ई.डी०), तारीख 22 जुलाई, 1974, 1 अगस्त, 1974 की बजाए 5 अगस्त, 1974 से प्रभावी होगा।

[सं० 64/1974/फा० सं० 301/68/74: ई० डी०]

एम० बापू, प्रवर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 31st July, 1974

S.O. 2682.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the second proviso to sub-section (2) of Section 4 of the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that the Order No. 59 (F. No. 301/68/74-ED) dated 22nd July, 1974 shall have effect from 5th August, 1974 instead of 1st August, 1974.

[No. 64/1974/F. No. 301/68/74-BD]

S. BAPU, Under Secy.

बैंकिंग विभाग

नई दिल्ली, दिनांक 30 सितम्बर, 1974

का० प्रा० 2683.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, रिजर्व बैंक आफ इण्डिया की सिफारिश पर, एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 के उपबन्ध बैंक आफ कराड लि०, कराड पर निम्नलिखित एस्यावर सम्पत्तियों के विषय में, 6 जनवरी, 1975 तक लागू नहीं होंगे:—

(i) सी० एस० न० 2049/ए, ए वार्ड, शिवाजी पेट, कोल्हापुर

(ii) सी० एस० न० 1926/ए वार्ड, ए वार्ड, शिवाजी पेट, कोल्हापुर

[सं० 15(21) बी० प्रा० 111/74]

Department of Banking

New Delhi, the 30th September, 1974.

S.O. 2683.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of section 9 of the said Act shall not apply, till the 6th January 1975, to the Bank of Karad Ltd., Karad, in respect of the following immovable properties:—

(i) C. S. No. 2049/A, A Ward, Shivaji Peth, Kolhapur.

(ii) C. S. No. 1926, A Ward, Shivaji Peth, Kolhapur.

[No. 15(21)-B. O. III/74]

का० प्रा० 2684.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार रिजर्व बैंक आफ इण्डिया की सिफारिश पर, एतद्वारा घोषित करती है:—

(क) : कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 की उपधारा (i) के खण्ड (ग) के उपखण्ड (i) और (ii) के उपबन्ध, इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से एक वर्ष की अवधि तक "आन्ध्र बैंक लि०", हैदराबाद पर वहाँ तक लागू नहीं होंगे जहाँ तक कि वे उपबन्ध इस बैंक के अध्यक्ष और मुख्य कार्यकारी अधिकारी श्री के० के० तारायण की "आन्ध्र प्रदेश एण्ड उड़ीसा इण्डस्ट्रियल एण्ड टेक्निकल कन्सल्टेंसी प्रायोनाइजेशन लि०", का निदेशक बनने से इसलिये प्रतिषिद्ध करते हैं कि वह कम्पनी अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 1) के अधीन एक पंजीयित कम्पनी है, और

(ख) : कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 19 की उपधारा (3) के उपबन्ध इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से एक वर्ष की अवधि तक उपर्युक्त बैंक पर वहाँ तक लागू नहीं होंगे जहाँ तक कि उक्त उपबन्ध उक्त बैंक की "आन्ध्र प्रदेश एण्ड उड़ीसा इण्डस्ट्रियल एण्ड टेक्निकल कन्सल्टेंसी प्रायोनाइजेशन लि०" के ग्रंथ धारण करने से प्रतिषिद्ध करते हैं।

[सं० 15(23) बी० प्रा० III/74]

(से० प्रा० उमगावकर)

प्रवर सचिव भारत सरकार

New Delhi, the 1st October, 1974

S.O. 2684.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares:

(a) that the provisions of sub-clause (i) and (ii) of clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the said Act shall not apply to the Andhra Bank Ltd., Hyderabad for a period of one year from the date of this notification, in so far as the said provision prohibit Shri K. K. Narayan, its Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, from being a director of the Andhra Pradesh and Orissa Industrial and Technical Consultancy organisation Ltd. being a company registered under the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956); and

(b) that the provisions of sub-section (3) of section 19 of the said Act shall not apply for a period of one year from the date of this notification to the abovementioned bank in so far as the said provisions prohibit the said bank from holding shares in the Andhra Pradesh and Orissa Industrial and Technical Consultancy Organisation Ltd.

[No. 15(23)-B. O. III/74]

M. B. USGAONKAR, Under Secy.

रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया

नई दिल्ली, 27 नवम्बर, 1974

रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में नवम्बर 1974 की 20 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए चेखा

इष्ट विभाग

देयताएं	रुपये	रुपये	प्राप्तियां	रुपये	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट	47,85,96,000		सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन ---		
संचालन में नोट	6006,17,08,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,05,000	
			(ख) भारत में बाहर रखा हुआ		
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां	141,73,97,000	
जारी किये गये कुल नोट	6054,03,04,000		जाइ		324,27,02,000
			रुपये का सिक्का		18,51,89,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रति-		
			भूतियां		5711,24,13,000
			वैदेशी विनियम बिल और दूसरे बाणिज्य-पत्र		..
कुल देयताएं	6054,03,04,000		कुल प्राप्तियां		6054,03,04,000

तारीख 25 नवम्बर, 1974

[सं. क्र० 10 (1) 74 बी० प्रो I]

आर० क्र० प्रजारी, उप गवर्नर

20 नवम्बर 1974 को रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	प्राप्तियां	रुपये
चुक्ता पूंजी	5,00,00,000	नोट	47,85,96,000
भारत में निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का	2,83,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण		छोटा सिक्का	3,88,000
(दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि	284,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल	
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण		(क) वैदेशी	167,31,20,000
(स्थगितकरण) निधि	95,00,00,000	(ख) विदेशी	..
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल	720,78,17,000
(दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि	265,00,00,000	विदेशों में रखा हुआ ऋण*	508,34,78,000
जमा राशि---		निवेश**	124,04,50,000
(क) सरकारी		ऋण और अधिम ---	
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	84,04,89,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	7,55,88,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को	73,83,89,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और अधिम---	
(i) अनुसूचित बाणिज्य बैंक	584,48,12,000	(i) अनुसूचित बाणिज्य बैंकों को ×	100,31,50,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	14,80,73,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को × ×	236,45,69,000
		(iii) दूसरों को	20,64,60,000
(iii) शेष अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	1,49,38,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि में ऋण,	
(iv) अन्य बैंक	71,50,000	अधिम और निवेश	
		(क) ऋण और अधिम :---	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	67,86,74,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	14,83,33,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को	..
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित्त निगम को	64,00,00,000

व्ययताप	रुपये	प्राप्तियां	रुपये
(ग) अन्य	363,16,23,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिपोजिटों में निवेश राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम	11,27,48,000
वेय बिल	109,49,21,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से	47,89,18,000
अन्य वेयताप	530,93,02,000	ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश (क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम	195,76,14,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बॉन्डों/डिपोजिटों में निवेश	
		अन्य प्राप्तियां	94,29,09,000
रुपये	2495,68,96,000	रुपये	2495,68,96,000

* नकदी, आवधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियां शामिल हैं।

** राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

‡ राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं है, परन्तु राज्य सरकारों को दिये गये अस्थायी प्रोव्हीडेंट शामिल हैं।

× रिजर्व बैंक आक इडिवा अधिनियम की धारा 17 (4) (ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित आणख्य बैंकों को मीयादी बिलों पर अग्रिम दिये गये 17,02,00,000 रुपये शामिल हैं।

× × राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं है।
तारीख : 25 सितम्बर, 1974

प्रार० के० हजारी उप गवर्नर

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

New Delhi, 27th September, 1974

S.O. 2685.—An account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 20th day of September, 1974

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	47,85,96,000		Gold Coin and Bullion:—		
			(a) Held in India	182,53,05,000	
Notes in circulation	6006,17,08,000		(b) Held outside India		
Total Notes issued		6054,03,04,000	Foreign Securities	141,73,97,000	
			Total		324,27,02,000
			Rupee Coin		18,51,89,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		5711,24,13,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other Commercial paper		
Total Liabilities		6054,03,04,000	Total Assets		6054,03,04,000

Dated the 25th day of September, 1974.

R. K. HAZARI, Dy. Governor

New Delhi, the 27th September, 1974.

Statement of the Affairs of the reserve bank of India, banking Department as on the 20th September, 1974

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid up	5,00,00,000	Notes	47,85,96,000
		Rupee Coin	2,83,000
Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Small Coin	3,88,000
		Bills Purchased and Discounted:—	
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	284,00,00,000	(a) Internal	167,31,20,000
		(b) External
		(c) Government Treasury Bills	720,78,17,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	95,00,00,000	Balances Held Abroad*	508,34,78,000
		Investment **	124,04,50,000
		Loans and advances to:—	
National Industrial Credit (long Term Operations) Fund	265,00,00,000	(i) Central Government
		(ii) State Governments@	73,83,89,000
		Loans and Advances to:—	
Deposits:—		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	100,31,50,000
(a) Government		(ii) State Co-operative Banks‡	236,45,69,000
(i) Central Government	84,04,89,000	(iii) Others	20,64,60,000
(ii) State Governments	7,55,88,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
(b) Banks		(a) Loans and Advances to:—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	584,48,12,000	(i) State Governments	67,86,74,000
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	14,80,73,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks	14,93,33,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,49,38,000	(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks
(iv) Other Banks	71,50,000	(iv) Agricultural Refinance Corporation	64,00,00,000
(c) Others	363,16,23,000	(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Banks Debentures	11,27,48,000
Bills Payable	109,49,21,000	Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
Other Liabilities	530,93,02,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	47,89,18,000
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	195,76,14,000
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank
		Other Assets	94,29,09,000
RUPEES	24,95,68,96,000	RUPEES	24,95,68,96,000

* Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

** Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (long term Operations) Fund.

(n) Excluding loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

† Includes Rs. 17,02,00,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4) (c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

‡ Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Funds.

Dated the 25th day of September, 1974.

[No. F/10. (1)/74-BOI.]

नई दिल्ली, 4 अक्टूबर, 1974

क्र०प्र० 268 6—रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में सितम्बर 1974 को 27 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा
इशू विभाग

देयताएं	रुपये	प्रास्तियां	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग में		सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन —	
रखे हुए नोट	42,26,15,000	(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,05,000
		(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ	..
संचयन में नोट	5908,88,17,000	विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां	141,73,97,000
		जोड़	3,24,27,02,000
जारी किये गये कुल नोट	59,51,14,32,000	रुपये का सिक्का	20,64,23,000
		भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रति- भूतियां	56,06,23,07,000
		देशी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य पत्र	
कुल देयताएं	59,51,14,32,000	कुल प्रास्तियां	59,51,14,32,000
तारीख 2 अक्टूबर, 1974			भार० के० हजारी, उप गवर्नर

27 सितम्बर, 1974 को रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	प्रास्तियां	रुपये
सुकता पूंजी	5,00,00,000	नोट	42,26,15,000
भारक्षित निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का	4,55,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि	284,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का	3,95,000
		खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल	
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि	95,00,00,000	(क) देशी	158,17,37,000
		(ख) विदेशी	..
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि	265,00,00,000	(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल	726,84,42,000
		विदेशों से रखा हुआ ऋण*	474,67,05,000
जमा राशियां :—		निवेश**	179,76,08,000
(क) सरकारी		ऋण और ग्रामिम :—	
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	58,01,50,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	..
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	8,61,43,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को	75,31,26,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और ग्रामिम :—	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	541,46,53,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को†	86,61,50,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	15,57,64,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को††	249,60,86,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	1,39,62,000	(iii) दूसरों को	7,89,20,000
(vi) अन्य बैंक	88,88,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण, ग्रामिम और निवेश	
		(क) ऋण और ग्रामिम :—	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	67,83,39,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	14,89,54,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबधक बैंकों को	..
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित्त निगम को	64,00,00,000

देयताएं	रुपये	प्रास्तियां	रुपये
(ग) अन्य	437,10,13,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबंधक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम	17,27,48,000
वेय बिल	120,16,07,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश	47 71,58,000
अन्य देयताएं	530,47,93,000	(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम (ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किए गये बांडों/डिबेंचरों में निवेश	209,73,58,000
		अन्य प्रास्तियां	96,11,77,000
	25,12,69,73,000		25,12,69,73,000

*नकदी, भावधिक जमा और और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियां शामिल हैं।

**राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

(iii) राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से प्रवर्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं, परन्तु राज्य सरकारों को दिये गये अस्थायी ओवरड्राफ्ट शामिल हैं।

†रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम की धारा 17 (4) (ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को मियादी खिलों पर अग्रिम दिये गये 17,34,00,000 रुपये शामिल हैं।

††राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रवर्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

भार० के० हजारी उप गवर्नर।

तारीख 2 अक्टूबर, 1974

[सं० फ० 10(1)/74-बी. ओ]

ज०ब० मीरबन्दान, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 4th October, 1974.

S. O.—2688 An account pursuant to the RESERVE BANK OF INDIA ACT, 1934, for the week ended the 27th day of September, 1974

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	42,26,15,000		Gold Coin and Bullion:—		
Notes in circulation	59,08,88,17,000		(a) Held in India	182,53,05,000	
Total Notes issued		59,51,14,32,000	(b) Held outside India	..	
			Foreign Securities	141,73,97,000	
			Total		324,27,02,000 20,64,23,000
			Rupee Coin		
			Government of India Rupee Securities		56,06,23,07,000
			External Bills of Exchange and other Commercial paper		..
Total Liabilities		59,51,14,32,000	Total Assets		59,51,14,32,000

R.K. HAZARI, Dy Governor

Dated the 2nd day of October 1974.

Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 27th September, 1974

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid up	5,00,00,000	Notes	42,26,15,000
Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Rupee Coin	4,55,000
		Small Coin	3,95,000
		Bill Purchased and Discounted:—	
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	284,00,00,000	(a) Internal	158,17,37,000
		(b) External	..
		(c) Government Treasury Bills	726,74,42,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	95,00,00,000	Balances Held Abroad*	474,67,05,000
		Investments**	179,76,08,000
		Loans and Advances to:—	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	265,00,00,000	(i) Central Government	..
		(ii) State Governments@	75,31,26,000
		Loans and Advances to:—	
Deposits:—		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	86,61,50,000
(a) Government		(ii) State Co-operative Banks††	249,60,86,000
(i) Central Government	58,01,50,000	(iii) Others	7,89,20,000
(ii) State Governments	8,61,43,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
(b) Banks		(a) Loans and Advances to:—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	541,46,53,000	(i) State Governments	67,83,39,000
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	15,57,64,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks	14,89,54,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,39,62,000	(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	..
(iv) Other Banks	88,88,000	(iv) Agricultural Refinance Corporation	64,00,00,000
(c) Others	437,10,13,000	(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	11,27,48,000
Bills Payable	120,16,07,000	Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
Other Liabilities	530,47,93,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	47,71,58,000
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	209,73,58,000
		(b) Investment in Bonds/Debentures issued by the Development Bank	..
		Other Assets	96,11,77,000
Rupees	25,12,69,73,000	Rupees	25,12,69,73,000

*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

**Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 17,34,00,000 advanced to Scheduled commercial Banks against usance bills under Section 17(4) (c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

††Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund

Dated the 2nd day of October 1974.

R.K. HAZARI Dy. Governor

[No. F 10(1)/74—BO(1)]

C W Mirchandani, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 1 अक्टूबर, 1974

बम्बई, 27 अगस्त, 1974

का. आ. 2687.—भारतीय स्टेट बैंक अधिनियम, 1955 (1955 का 23) की धारा 21 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (ग) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के परामर्श से श्री जगन्नाथ प्रसाद 'स्वतन्त्र', मालिक, बिहार पादुकालय, पटना, को 1 अक्टूबर, 1974 से पटना स्थानीय बोर्ड के सदस्य के रूप में नामित करती है।

[सं. फा. 8/5/74-बी. ओ.]

डू. म. सुकथनकर, निदेशक

S.O. 2687.—In pursuance of clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 21 of the State Bank of India Act, 1955 (23 of 1955), the Central Government, in consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby nominate Shri Jagannath Prasad "Swatantra", Owner, Bihar Padukalaya, Patna to be a member of the Patna Local Board with effect from 1st October, 1974.

[No. F. 8/5/74-BO.]

D. M. SUKTHANKAR, Director.

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क समारोह का कार्यालय

बम्बई, 16 जुलाई, 1974

का. आ. 2688.—इस समाहृतिय से दिनांक 2 दिसम्बर, 1971 को जारी अधिसूचना संख्या सी. ई. आर./173जी (4)/71 के साथ मल्टी उत्पाद शुल्क योग्य वस्तुओं की सूची में निम्न और संशोधन आदेशित किये जाते हैं।

क्रम संख्या 19 के बाद निम्न सन्निविष्ट किया जाये :—

क्रम संख्या	(टैरिफ मद संख्या)	(विवरण)	(महत्वपूर्ण कच्चे माल का नाम)
1	2	3	4
20. 14 बी बी		सोडियम सिलिकेट	सोडा ऐश/सोल्युबल ग्लास
21 31		इलेक्ट्रिक बैटरियां आई. सी. बैटरियां	शीशा कार्बन छड़ें
22. 34		टैंकर्स तथा ट्रेलर्स	एक्सल तथा टायर

[क्र. उ. शु. अधि. सं. सी. ई. आर./137 जी. (5)/1974-फा. सं. बी. (30)-170/मिस्ते/71]

OFFICE OF THE CENTRAL EXCISE COLLECTORATE

Bombay, the 16th July, 1974

O.S. 2688.—The following further amendments are ordered in the list of excisable commodities appended to this Collectorate Notification No. CER/173G(4)/71, dated the 2nd December, 1971.

After Sr. No. 19 insert the following.—

Sl. No.	(T. I. No.)	(Description)	(Name of important Raw Material).
1	2	3	4
20	14BB	Sodium Silicate	Soda Ash/Soluble glass.
21	31	Ele. Batteries Dry Batteries	Carbon Rods
22	34	Tankers and Trailors	Axles and Tyres.

[Notifn. No. C. Ex. CER/173G(5)/1974—F. No. V(30)-29/Misc. 174]

का. आ. 2689.—इस समाहृतिय से दिनांक 2 दिसम्बर, 1971 को जारी अधिसूचना संख्या सी. ई. आर./173जी (4)/1971 के साथ मल्टी उत्पाद शुल्क योग्य वस्तुओं की सूची में निम्न और संशोधन आदेशित किये जाते हैं।

क्रम संख्या 22 के बाद निम्न सन्निविष्ट किया जाये :—

क्रम संख्या (टैरिफ मद संख्या)	(विवरण)	महत्वपूर्ण कच्चे माल का नाम)	
1	2	3	4
23. 1 बी	डिब्बा बन्द मछली या चातू प्राधान, शीशे तैयार तथा परिवर्धित के आर तथा बोतले खाद्यों के अन्य पदार्थ		
24 14 एक	सौंदर्य वर्धक (क्रास्मे-टिक्स तथा प्रसाधन तैयार करना		
	(1) डेल्टम एव फेम पाउडर सोपस्टोन पाउडर		
	(2) स्तो तथा बेनिशिंग स्टेयूरिक एसिड क्रोम		
	(3) क्रोम तथा कोलड क्रोम	(अ) तरल पेरफोम (ब) लानोलाइन (स) सफेद बेसलीन	
	(4) शैम्पू	परिशोधित वनस्पति तेल	
	(5) लिफ्टस्टक	मम्मिश्रित मोम वैक्सिस	
	(6) हेयर लोशन	तरल पेरफोम	
	(7) पोमेड	बेसलीन	
25. 30 ए	विद्युत चालित पम्प		
	(1) सेन्ट्रीफ्यूगल	इम्पेलर 1:1 शाफ्ट 1:2 बाल बीयरिंग 2:1	
	(2) मोनो ब्लक	इलेक्ट्रिक मोटर 1:1	

[क्र. उ. शु. अधि. सं. सी. ई. आर./173 जी. (6)/1974-फा. सं. बी. (30)-29/मिस्ते/74]

ज्योतिमय दत्त, समाहर्ता

Bombay, the 27th August, 1974

S.O. 2689.—The following further amendments are ordered in the list of excisable commodities appended to this Collectorate Notification No. CER/173G(4)/71, dated the 2nd December, 1971.

After Sr. No. 22 insert the following:—

Sr. No.	(T.I.No.)	(Description)	(Name of important Raw Material).
1	2	3	4
23	IB	Canned fish or other items of P or P Foods.	Metal containers, glass jars or bottles.
24	14F	Cosmetics & Toilet Preparations.	
		(i) Talcum & Face Powder	Soap stone powder
		(ii) Snow and Vani-shing	Stearic Acid

1	2	3	4
		(iii) Cream & Cold Cream	(a) Liquid Paraffin (b) Lanoline (c) White Veseline
		(iv) Shampoo	Refined Vegetable Oils
		(v) Lipstic	Blended waxes
		(vi) Hair Lotion	Liquid paraffin
		(vii) Pomade	Veseline
25	30-A	Powder driven pumps	
		(i) Centrifugal	Impeller 1:1 shaft 1:2 Ball Bearings 2:1
		(ii) Monoblock	Electric Motor 1:1

[Notification, No. C. Ex. CER/173 G. (6)/1974-F. No. V(30)-29/7Misc./74]

J. DATTA, Collector.

केन्द्रीय उत्पादशुल्क समाहर्तालय का कार्यालय

पूना, 7 अगस्त, 1974

क्रा० प्रा० 2690.—केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क नियम 1944 के नियम 5 के अधीन मुक्त में निहित शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, मैं रा० बि० मुखटणकर, समाहर्ता, केन्द्रीय उत्पादशुल्क पूना, एतद्वारा नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ 4 में विनिर्दिष्ट पूना केन्द्रीय उत्पादशुल्क समाहर्तालय के सभी केन्द्रीय उत्पादशुल्क अधिकारियों को सारणी के स्तम्भ 3 में उल्लिखित केन्द्रीय उत्पादशुल्क नियमों के अधीन अपने अपने अधिकार क्षेत्र में समाहर्ता की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिये प्राधिकृत करता हूँ।

सारणी

क्रम सं० प्रयुक्त की जाने वाली शक्तियों केन्द्रीय उत्पादशुल्क अधिकारी की श्रेणी का स्वरूप नियम			
1	2	3	4
1.	पूरी अवधि या अपेक्षाकृत कम अवधि लिये विशेष पद्धति हेतु पहला आवेदनपत्र प्रतिलिखित करना	96 जैड ओ (1) अधीक्षक और 96 जैड ओ (2)	
2.	जिस अवधि के लिये विनिर्माता को विशेष पद्धति के अनुसार काम करने की अनुमति दी गई थी, उस अवधि में उक्त पद्धति का उपयोग न कर पाने की उचित सूचना न देने के कारण उक्त विनिर्माता को विशेष पद्धति के अनुसार काम करने से प्रवारित करना।	96 जैड ओ (3) सहायक समाहर्ता	

1	2	3	4
3.	(क) तबीकरण प्रपत्र, ए० एम० 96 जैड ओ (4) अधीक्षक पी० में प्रतिलिखित करना		
	(ख) तबीकरण के लिये ए० एम० 96 जैड ओ (4) पी० प्रस्तुत करने में हुई देरी माफ करना	(1) अधीक्षक 15 दिनों से अधिक देरी माफ करने के लिये (2) सहायक सम-हर्ता 15 दिनों से अधिक देरी माफ करने के लिये	
4.	निकासी के आवेदन के लिये प्रपत्र ए० एम० 11 प्रस्तुत करने में हुई देरी माफ करना और मासिक निक्षेपों में हुई देरियां माफ करना	96 जैड क्यू (2)	(1) अधीक्षक, हर मामले में 15 दिनों से अधिक देरी माफ करने के लिये (2) सहायक सम-हर्ता यदि देरी उपर्युक्त (1) में बताई गई सीमा से ज्यादा हो।
5.	मिथ्या कथन आदि के लिये निम्नलिखित बंध देना		
	(i) शेष शुल्क की मांग करना	96 जैड एस (1)	अधीक्षक
	(ii) माल जम्ब करना	96 जैड एस (1)	'न्यायनिर्णयन' अधिकारी, उनकी शक्तियों की सीमाओं के अनुसार
	(iii) पांच हजार से अधिक का बंध देना	96 जैड एस	न्यायनिर्णयन अधिकारी उनकी शक्तियों की सीमाओं के अनुसार

[क्र० उ० नि० सं०/1/74-फा० सं० V (19) 30-17/डी० सी०/72]

रा० बि० मुखटणकर समाहर्ता,

Central Excise Collectorate

Poona, the 7th August, 1974

S. O. 2690.—In exercise of the powers vested in me under Rule 5 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, I.R.V. Sukhantankar, Collector of Central Excise, Poona, hereby authorise all Officers of Central Excise in the Poona Central Excise Collectorate specified in Column 4 of the table below to exercise within their respective jurisdiction the powers of Collector under the Central Excise Rules, mentioned in Column 3 of the table

TABLE

				1	2	3	4
S. No.	Nature of powers to be exercised.	C. Ex. Rules	Rank of Officers.				
1	2	3	4				
1.	To accept first application for the special procedure for a full period or for a shorter period.	96-ZO(1) & 96-ZO(2)	Superintendent.	4.	To condone delay in submission of application for removal in form A.R. 11 and to condone delays in making monthly deposits.	96-ZQ(2)	(1) Superintendent for condoning delays not exceeding 5 days in each case. (2) Asstt. Collector if the delay exceeds the limits under (1) above.
2.	To preclude a manufacturer from working under the Special procedure for failure to give proper notice for not availing of such procedure during the period for which permission has been granted to him.	96-ZO(3)	Asstt. Collector.	5.	To impose following penalties for misdeclaration, etc. (i) to demand difference of duty. (ii) to confiscate goods. (iii) to impose penalty not exceeding five thousand.	96-ZS(i) 96-ZS(ii) 96-ZS(iii)	Superintendent. Adjudicating Officer in accordance with their limits of powers, Adjudicating Officer in accordance with their limits of powers.
3.	(a) To accept renewal application in form A.S.P. (b) To condone delay in submission of A.S.P. for renewal.	96-ZO(4) 96-ZO(4)	Superintendent. (i) Superintendent for condoning delays not exceeding 15 days. (ii) Asstt. Collector for condoning delays exceeding 15 days.				

[CE. R. No. 1/74 F. No. V(19)30-17/TC/72]

Sd/-

R. V. SUKHATANKAR,
Collector of Central Excise

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क के समाहर्ता का कार्यालय

बंगलौर, 1974

क्रा० प्रा० 2691.—केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क नियमावली 1944 के नियम 5 के अंतर्गत प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित सारणी के स्तम्भ 2 में बताए गए अधिकारियों को उनके अपने-अपने अधिकार क्षेत्र में, स्तम्भ 3 में बनाए गए नियम तथा उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ 4 में उल्लिखित सीमाओं तथा शर्तों के अधीन समाहर्ता की शक्तियाँ प्रयोग करने का अधिकार प्रदान करता हूँ।

क्रम संख्या	अधिकारी का पद	केन्द्रीय उत्पाद नियमावली	शर्तें तथा सीमाएं
1	2	3	4
1.	केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क के अधीक्षक	96-जैड ओ (1) एवं 96-जैड ओ (2)	पूर्ण अवधि या कुछ कम अवधि के लिए विशेष कार्यविधि संबंधी प्रथम आवेदन पत्र स्वीकार करना।
2.	यथोपरि	96 जैड ओ (4)	(क) ए०एस०पी० प्रथम में नवीकरण का आवेदन पत्र स्वीकार करना। (ख) ए०एस०पी० आवेदन पत्र के नवीकरण के प्रस्तुतीकरण में ऐसे विलम्ब को क्षमा करने की शक्ति, जिसकी अवधि 15 दिन से अधिक न हो।
3.	यथोपरि	96 जैड एम (2)	प्रत्येक मामले में लिक़ासी के लिए प्रथम ए०आर० 11 में प्रस्तुत किए गए आवेदनों के प्रस्तुतीकरण में हुए विलम्ब की क्षमा, जिसकी अवधि 5 दिन से अधिक नहीं तथा मासिक जमा में हुए विलम्ब को क्षमा करने की शक्ति।
4.	यथोपरि	96 जैड एस (i)	मिथ्या घोषणा इत्यादि के बारे में शुल्कान्तर की मांग करना।
5.	न्याय निर्णयन अधिकारी, उनकी शक्तियों की सीमा के अनुसार	96 जैड एस (ii)	माल को जब्त करना।
6.	यथोपरि	96 जैड एम (iii)	ऐसी शक्ति अधिरोपित करना जिसकी राशि 5,000 रु० से अधिक न हो।

1	2	3	4
7.	सहायक समाहर्ता	96 जेड ओ (3)	ऐसे अभिनर्माता को, विशेष कार्यविधि के अन्तर्गत कार्य करने से बाधित करना जिसने अनुमेय अवधि के दौरान विशेष कार्यविधि उपसम्भन करने के लिए उचित नोटिस न दिया हो।
8.	सहायक समाहर्ता	96 जेड ओ (4)	नवीकरण के लिए ए०एस०पी० के प्रस्तुतीकरण में हुए 15 दिन की अवधि से अधिक विलम्ब को क्षमा करने की शक्ति।
9.	सहायक समाहर्ता	96 जेड यू (2)	प्रत्येक मामले में, ए० आर० 11 प्रपत्र में, माल की निकासी के लिए आवेदन प्रस्तुत करने में ऐसे विलम्ब की क्षमा जो 5 दिन से अधिक न हो तथा तिमाही जमा में हुए विलम्ब को क्षमा करने की शक्ति।

[दिनांक 22-8-74 की अधिसूचना सं० 2/74—

[सी०सं० 4/1/74-बी-2]

आर०बी० सिन्हा, समाहर्ता

OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE

Bangalore, the 1974.

S.O. 2691.—In exercise of the powers vested in me under Rule 5 of Central Excise Rule 1944, I hereby empower the officers mentioned in Column 2 of the table below, to exercise within their respective Jurisdiction the powers of Collector under the Rule enumerated in Column 3, subject to the conditions and limitations set out in Column 4 of the said table.

Sl. No.	Rank of officer	C. Ex. Rules	Conditions and Limitations.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	Supdt. of C.Ex.	96 ZO(1) and 96 ZO(2)	To accept first application for the special procedure for a full period or for a shorter period.
2.	-do-	96 ZO(4)	(a) To accept renewal application in form ASP (b) To condone delay not exceeding 15 days in submission of ASP for renewal.
3.	-do-	96 ZQ(2)	To condone delay not exceeding 5 days in each case in submission of application for removal in form AR 11 and to condone delays in making monthly deposits.
4.	-do-	96 ZS(i)	To demand difference of duty for misdeclaration etc.
5.	Adjudicating officer in accordance with their limits of powers.	96 ZS(ii)	To confiscate goods.
6.	-do-	96 ZS(iii)	To impose penalty not exceeding five thousand rupees.
7.	Asstt. Collector	96 ZO(3)	To preclude a manufacturer from working under the special procedure for failure to give proper notice for not availing of such procedure during the period for which permission has been granted to him.
8.	Asstt. Collector	96 ZO(4)	To condone delay exceeding 15 days in submission of ASP for renewal.
9.	Asstt. Collector	96 ZO(2)	To condone delay exceeding 5 days in each case in submission of application for removal in form A.R. 11 and to condone delays in making quarterly deposits.

[Notification No. 2/74 dated 22-8-74—

C. No. IV/1/74-B-2]

R.B. SINHA, Collector

कार्यालय आय-कर आयुक्त

कानपुर, 17 अगस्त, 1974

क्रा० प्रा० 2692—आय-कर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 287 की उप-धारा (1) के अनुसरण में निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों के नामों का प्रकाशन, जनहित में इष्टानुकूल होगा —

भाग-अ (1) ऐसे व्यक्ति जिन पर 25000/— रुपये और इससे अधिक का कर 31-3-74 को 9 माह से अधिक परन्तु 15 महीने की अवधि से अधिक नहीं, बकाया था

क्रम संख्या	करदाता का नाम एवं पता	कर-निर्धारण वर्ष	कर-व्यक्तिक्रम
1	2	3	4
शून्य			

भाग-अ (II) ऐसे व्यक्ति जिन पर, दिनांक 31-3-1974 को 1 वर्ष और 3 माह की अवधि के लिये परन्तु 2 वर्ष और 3 माह की अवधि से अधिक नहीं, 25000/—रुपये अवधि उमसे अधिक कर बकाया था।

क्रम संख्या	करदाता का नाम एवं पता	कर-निर्धारण वर्ष	कर-व्यक्तिक्रम
1	2	3	4
1.	श्री लाला राम कल्याण, उन्नाव।	1966-67 से 1970-71	34,318

भाग-अ (III) ऐसे व्यक्ति जिन पर 2 वर्ष 3 माह या इससे अधिक अवधि के लिये, 25000/—रुपये और इससे ऊपर का कर बकाया था।

क्रम संख्या	करदाता का नाम एवं पता	कर-निर्धारण वर्ष	कर-व्यक्तिक्रम
1	2	3	4
1.	श्री के० यम० रणदी महमद द्वारा के० यम० रणदी एण्ड सस मेरठ (व्यक्तिगत)	1946-47	2,87,357
2.	श्री जी० पी० भटनागर, मेरठ (व्यक्तिगत)	1915-46	60,000
3.	श्री सी० यल० मिश्रा डब्लू के० रोड, मेरठ (व्यक्तिगत)	1955-56 से 1965-66	46,512
4.	मनोहर लाल बाबू राम बेगम बाबा, मेरठ (फर्म)	1943-44	38,372
5.	श्री पी० पी० रमनांगी द्वारा मैमर्स राजीव प्रकाशन मेरठ (व्यक्तिगत)	1969-70	36,061

1	2	3	4
6.	श्री बी० मेहगल, टेकेबार, मेरठ (व्यक्तिगत)	1966-67 से 1967-68	25,559
7.	श्री कैलाशचरन राय (स्व०) हैरिस-राज कानपुर (व्यक्तिगत)	1942-43 से 1961-62	13,37,002
8.	श्री यम० पी० गुप्ता, द्वारा मैमर्स कानपुर प्लेट मिल्स (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, कानपुर	1958-59 से 1970-71	2,98,603
9.	श्री कैलाश नाम भगवान कानपुर	1959-60	70,000
10.	मैमर्स कृष्ण चन्द्र बृजकिशोरबिन्दकी से	1942-43 से 1952-53	48,556
11.	मैमर्स ईस्टन टैनरीज, कानपुर।	1944-45 से 1950-51	75,424
12.	मैमर्स माधुर एन्ड मंजूर (प्रा०) लि०, कानपुर	1947-48 से 1957-58	76,039
13.	यु० पी० इम्पोर्ट एन्ड एक्सपोर्ट एजेंसी (लि०) कानपुर	1961-62 से 1962-63	47,410
14.	रजत इन्डस्ट्रीज (प्रा०) लि०, कानपुर	1961-62 से 1969-70	65,994
15.	टेक्सटाइल्स इन्जीनियरिंग (प्रा०) (i) लि०, कानपुर	1944-45 से 1945-46	27,174
	(ii)	1955-56 से 1964-65	
16.	मैमर्स रामनाथ गौड़ ट्रस्ट 48/265, जनरलगंज, कानपुर	1954-55 से 1969-70	
17.	मैमर्स कानपुर व्यापारि मिल्स कं० (प्रा०) लि० कानपुर	1955-56 से 1965-66	2,62,571
18.	मैमर्स कानपुर प्लेट मिल्स (प्रा०) लि० कानपुर	1948-49 से 1966-67	6,64,374
19.	मैमर्स स्व तागवण रामचन्द्र (प्रा०) लि० कानपुर	1958-59 से 1966-67	12,54,115
20.	एच० यम० बागला द्वारा कामूनी उत्तराधिकारी यम० यल० बागला (हिन्दु अविभाजित परिवार)	1947-48 से 1949-50	15,85,093

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
21. श्री या० यन० बागला कानपुर (व्यक्तिगत)	1945-46 मे 1958-49 और 1953-54	10,69,167		26. मेसर्स लक्ष्मी रत्न काटन मिल्स कम्पनी लि०, कानपुर	1962-63	2,02,500	
22. श्री भार० पी० बागला कानपुर (हिन्दू अविभाजित परिवार)	1947-48 1949-50 1957-58 मे 1962-63 और 1963-64	17,61,778		27. श्री रामगोपाल गुप्ता, कानपुर	1961-62 और 1963-64	1,59,164	
23. श्री यम० यन० बागला पारवती बागला के कानूनी उत्तराधिकारी कानपुर	1944-45	54,614		28. श्रीमती राम जानकी देवी, कानपुर	1965-66	40,973	
24. श्री एम० डी० जूट मिल्स कम्पनी (लि०) कानपुर	1960-61 और 1964-65	1,35,922		29. श्रीमती मीरा रानी गुप्ता, कानपुर	1963-64 64-65 और 1968-69	1,10,693	
25. मेसर्स गंगाधर दोषारोष्य खेबा बैजनाथ, कानपुर	1942 से अवधि (सी० ए० पी०) और कर-निर्धारण वर्ष (ए० बाइस) 1958- 1959	30,51,509		30. मेसर्स बी० भार० कोटी, (रजिस्टर्ड फर्म)	1965-66	81,310	
				31. श्री विनोद कुमार गुप्त,	1967-68 और 1968-69	95,846	
				32. मेसर्स गुप्ता ब्रादर्स (प्रा०) लि०	1953-54	40,808	
				33. मेसर्स नारायण बास गंगा सरन, हाथ-रस (हिन्दू अविभाजित परिवार)	1948-49 मे 1956-57	62,490	

भाग ब-(1)

भायकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 287 की उप धारा (1) के अनुसरण में निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों के नामों का प्रकाशन जनहित के दृष्टानुसार होगा।

1—ऐसे व्यक्तियों अथवा हिन्दू अविभाजित परिवारों के नाम, जिन पर 1973-74 के वित्तीय वर्ष के दौरान, एक लाख रुपये से अधिक का भायकर निर्धारित किया गया।

क्रम संख्या	करदाता के नाम एवं पते	प्राप्ति	कर निर्धारण वर्ष	प्रस्तुत भाय	निर्धारित भाय	करदाता द्वारा देय कर	करदाता द्वारा चुकताकर
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	श्रीमती अनुसुया देवी गुप्ता, बिहारी निवास, कानपुर	व्यक्तिगत	1973-74	2,88,062	2,88,260	2,38,674	63,868 (टी० डी० यम०)
2.	श्री अजय पति सिहानिया, कमला टावर, कानपुर	"	1971-72	41,892	1,17,960	60,483	37,218
3.	श्री रघुपत सिहानिया, कानपुर	"	"	98,330	1,22,290	52,256	43,900
4.	श्री श्रीपत सिहानिया, कानपुर	"	"	1,92,088	2,97,770	1,53,328	1,41,690
5.	श्री हरि शंकर सिहानिया, कानपुर	"	"	2,74,980	1,94,030	1,89,155	1,31,896
6.	श्री विजय पात सिहानिया, कानपुर	"	"	1,88,198	2,07,010	39,161	39,161
7.	श्री लक्ष्मीपत सिहानिया, कानपुर	(हि० अ० प०)	"	शून्य	3,18,507	1,16,237	39,659

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8	श्री पदमपत मिहानियां, कानपुर	(हि० अ० प०)	1971-72	शून्य	1,08,930	72,314	13,682
9.	श्री लक्ष्मीपत मिहानियां, कानपुर	व्यक्तिगत	"	1,30,342	1,59,500	92,101	81,835
10.	श्री सोहन लाल मिहानियां, कानपुर	"	"	1,74,758	2,12,670	1,31,125	99,144
11.	श्री गोपाल कृष्ण मिहानियां, कानपुर	"	"	2,64,411	3,72,760	2,28,107	1,04,480
12.	श्री सीताराम मिहानियां, कानपुर	"	"	1,29,659	1,41,626	21,011	10,478
13.	श्री हेमन्त पत मिहानियां, कानपुर	(हि० अ० प०)	"	74,575	1,45,970	87,708	26,629
14.	श्रीमती राजकुमारी अग्रवाल, द्वारा मोबी भवन, मोबीनगर	व्यक्तिगत	1973-74	1,34,110	1,34,110	83,207	79,577
15.	श्री अमिय चन्द्र जैन, द्वारा एमिस्ट्रा (इंडिया) प्रा० लि०, मेरठ।	"	1971-72	73,470	1,05,290	69,895	35,672
16.	श्री रघुनाथ महाय, डी० सी० यम० नई दिल्ली	"	1971-72	99,289	1,04,200	17,249	—
17.	श्री बी० यल० कपूर, मवाना शूनार मिल्स, मवाना	"	1973-74	2,24,404	2,25,000	प्रतिनिधियन (टी० डी० यम० के पश्चात्) वापसी	—

भाग—ब—(II) ऐसी फर्मों कम्पनियों अथवा व्यक्तियों की संस्थाओं के नाम जिन पर 1973-74 के वित्तीय वर्ष के दौरान दस लाख से अधिक की आय पर, कर आका गया।

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	मेसर्स श्रिधर लैप्पम लि०, शिकोहाबाद	कम्पनी	1971-72	36,94,910	38,17,790	22,43,894	21,98,074
2	मेसर्स सिंह इन्जीनियरिंग वर्क्स (प्रा०) लि०, जी० टी० रोड कानपुर।	"	1972-73	43,07,954	50,64,560	30,37,500	30,37,500
3.	अपरइंडिया शूगर मिल्स लि० खटौली, मुजफ्फर नगर।	"	1971-72	3,69,427	13,62,570	7,49,114	1,00,000
4.	रोहन एण्ड ह्याम कम्पनी प्राफ फिलाडेल्फिया	"	1973-74	29,38,890	29,38,980	87,178	87,178
5.	संयुक्त राष्ट्र अमेरिका, द्वारा मलिकजाखर जीवन उद्योग बम्बई।						

भाग—स ऐसे व्यक्तियों के नाम, जिन पर 5000/- रु० का कम से कम जुर्माना लगाया गया और वर्ष 1973-74 के वित्तीय वर्ष के दौरान जिन की इस सिलसिले की कोई अपील भी विचाराधीन नहीं है।

क्रम संख्या	कर-दाता का नाम एवं पता	प्रास्थिति	कर निर्धारण वर्ष	धनराशि
1	2	3	4	5
1.	श्री के० के० माहेश्वरी, द्वारा, कुमार चदर्य, लियाक्षी गेट, मेरठ।	व्यक्तिगत	1970-71	7,300

Office of the Commissioner of Income-Tax

Kanpur, the 17th August, 1974

S.O. 2692.—In pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 287 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, it is expedient in the public interest to publish the names of the following persons :—

PART A (I) PERSONS IN DEFAULT OF PAYMENT OF TAX OF Rs. 25,000/- AND ABOVE FOR PERIOD EXCEEDING 9 MONTHS BUT NOT EXCEEDING 1 YEAR AND 3 MONTHS AS ON 31-3-1974.

Sl. No.	Name and Address of the Assessee	Assessment year	Tax default
1	2	3	4

BLANK

PART A (II) PERSONS IN DEFAULT OF PAYMENT OF TAX OF Rs. 25,000/- AND ABOVE FOR THE PERIOD OF 1 YEAR AND 3 MONTHS BUT NOT EXCEEDING 2 YEARS AND 3 MONTHS

Sl. No.	Name and Address of the Assessee	Asstt. year.	Tax default
1	2	3	4
1.	Shri Lala Ram Kalwar, Unnao	Indl. 1966-67 to 1970-71	34,318

PART A (III) PERSONS IN DEFAULT OF PAYMENT OF TAX OF Rs. 25,000/- AND ABOVE FOR THE PERIOD OF 2 YEARS 3 MONTHS AND ABOVE.

Sl. No.	Name and Address of the assessee.	Asstt. year	Tax default
1	2	3	4
1.	Shri K. S. Rashid Ahmad C/o K. S. Rashid & Sons, Meerut. (Indl.)	1946-47	2,87,357
2.	Shri D. P. Bhatnagar, Meerut. (Indl.)	1945-46	60,000
3.	Shri C. L. Sikka. W. K. Road, Meerut. (Indl.)	1955-56 to 1965-66	46,542
4.	Manohar Lal Babu Ram Begumbagh, Meerut. (Firm)	1943-44	38,372
5.	Shri B. P. Rastogi, C/o M/s. Rajeeva Prakashan Meerut. (Indl.)	1969-70	36,061
6.	Shri V. Sehgal, Contractor Meerut. (Indl.)	1966-67 to 1967-68	25,559
7.	Shri Kalicharan Ram (Deceased) Harishganj, Kanpur.	1942-43 to 1961-62	13,37,002
8.	Shri S. P. Gupta C/o M/s. Kanpur Plate Mills (P) Ltd., Kanpur.	1958-59 to 1970-71	2,98,603
9.	Shri Kailash Nath Agarwal, Kanpur.	1959-60	70,000
10.	M/s. Krishna Chandra Brij Kishore Bindki	1942-43 to 1952-53	48,556
11.	M/s. Eastern Tanneries, Kanpur.	1944-45 to 1950-51	75,424

1	2	3	4
12.	M/s. Mathur & Manoozoor (P) Ltd., Kanpur.	1947-48 to 1957-58	76,039
13.	U. P. Import & Export Agency Ltd., Kanpur.	1961-62 to 1962-63	47,410
14.	Rajat Industries (P) Ltd.	1961-62 to 1969-70	65,994
15.	Textiles Engg. (P) Ltd., Kanpur.	1944-45 to 1955-56 to 1964-65	27,174
16.	M/s. Ram Nath Gaur Trust, 48/265, Generalganj, Kanpur.	1954-55 to 1969-70	1,31,000
17.	M/s. Cawnpore Rolling Mills Co. (P) Ltd., Kanpur.	1955-56 to 1965-66	2,62,571
18.	M/s. Kanpur Plate Mills (P) Ltd., Kanpur.	1948-49 to 1966-67	6,64,374
19.	M/s. Roop Narain Ram Chandra (P) Ltd., Kanpur.	1958-59 to 1966-67	12,54,115
20.	H. S. Bagla Through L/ H S. N. Bagla (H. U. F.)	1947-48 to 1949-50	15,85,093
21.	Shri S. N. Bagla (Indl.), Kanpur.	1945-46 to 1948-49 & 1953-54	10,69,167
22.	Shri R. P. Bagla, Kanpur. HUF	1947-48 to 1949-50 to 1957-58 to 1962-63 & 1963-64	17,61,778
23.	Shri S. N. Bagla L/H of Parwati Bagla, Kanpur.	1944-45	54,614
24.	Shri M. D. Jute Mills Co. Ltd., Kanpur.	1960-61 & 1964-65	1,35,922
25.	M/s. Gangadhar Baijnath, Kanpur. CAP Ending & A. Ys.	1942 to 1946 to 1955-56 to 1958-59	30,51,509
26.	M/s. Laxmi Ratan Cotton Mills Co. Ltd., Kanpur.	1962-63	2,02,500
27.	Shri Ram Gopal Gupta, Kanpur.	1961-62 & 1963-64	1,59,164
28.	Smt. Ram Janki Devi, Kanpur.	1965-66	40,973
29.	Smt. Meera Rani Gupta, Kanpur.	1963-64 to 1964-65 & 1968-69	1,10,693
30.	M/s. B. R. Kothi (RF)	1965-66	81,310
31.	Shri Vinod Kumar Gupta	1967-68 & 1968-69	95,846
32.	M/s. Gupta Bros. (P) Ltd.	1953-54	40,808
33.	M/s. Narain Das Ganga Saran, Hathras (HUF)	1948-49 to 1956-57	62,490

Kanpur, the 17th August, 1974

In pursuance of sub-section (1) of Section 287 of the Income tax Act, 1961 it is expedient in the public interest to publish the names of the following persons:—

I. NAME OF INDIVIDUALS OR HINDU UNDIVIDED FAMILIES WHO HAVE BEEN ASSESSED ON AN INCOME OF MORE THAN ONE LAKH OF RUPEES DURING F.Y. 1973-74

Sl. No.	Name & address of the assessee	Status	A.Y.	Income returned	Income assessed	Tax payable by the assessee.	Tax paid by the assessee
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Smt. Ansuiya Devi Gupta, Behari Niwas, Kanpur	Indl.	1973-74	2,88,062	2,88,260	2,38,074	63,868(TDS)
2.	Shri Ajai Singhania, Kamla Tower Kanpur	..	1971-72	41,892	1,17,960	60,483	37,218
3.	Shri Raghupat Singhania, Kanpur	98,330	1,22,290	52,256	43,900
4.	Shri Sripat Singhania, Kanpur	1,92,088	2,97,770	1,53,328	1,41,690
5.	Shri Hari Shankar Singhania, Kanpur.	2,74,980	2,94,030	1,89,155	1,31,896
6.	Shri Vijai Pat Singhani, Kanpur.	1,88,198	2,07,010	39,161	39,161
7.	Shri Laxmipat Singhania, Kanpur.	HUF	..	NIL	3,18,507	1,16,237	39,659
8.	Shri Padampat Singhania, Kanpur	NIL	1,08,930	72,314	13,682
9.	Laxmipat Singhania, Kanpur	Indl.	..	1,30,342	1,59,500	92,101	81,835
10.	Shri Sohan Lal Singhania Kanpur	1,74,758	2,12,670	1,31,125	99,144
11.	Shri Gopal Krishan Singhania, Kanpur	2,64,411	3,72,760	2,28,107	1,04,450
12.	Shri Sita Ram Singhania, Kanpur	1,29,659	1,41,626	21,011	10,478
13.	Shri Hemant Pat Singhania, Kanpur	HUF	..	74,573	1,45,970	87,708	26,629
14.	Smt. Raj Kumari Agrawal, C/o Modi Bhawan, Modinagar	Indl	1973-74	1,34,110	1,34,110	83,207	79,977
15.	Shri Ami Chand Jain, C/o Electra (India) Pvt. Ltd. Meerut	..	1971-72	73,470	1,05,290	69,895	35,672
16.	Shri Raghunath Sahai, D.C.M., New Delhi.	99,289	1,04,200	17,249	—
17.	Shri B.L. Kapoor Mawana Sugar Mill, Mawana	..	1973-74	2,24,404	2,25,000	Refund (after TDS) —	

PART: B (II) NAME OF FIRMS, COMPANIES OR OTHER ASSOCIATION OF PERSONS, WHO HAVE BEEN ASSESSED ON AN INCOME OF MORE THAN TEN LAKHS OF RUPEES DURING F.Y. 1973-74

Sl. No.	Name and Address of the assessee	Status	A.Y.	Income returned	Income assessed	Tax payable by the assessee	Tax paid by the assessee
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	M/s. Hind Lamps Ltd. Shikohabad	Company	1971-72	36,94,910	38,17,790	22,43,894	21,98,074
2.	M/s. Singh Engg. Works (P) Ltd., G.T. Road, Kanpur.	..	1972-73	43,07,954	50,64,560	30,37,500	30,37,500
3.	Upper India Sugar Mills Ltd., Khatzuli, Muzaffarnagar	..	1971-72	3,69,427	13,62,570	7,49,414	1,00,000
4.	Rohm & Hass Co. of Philadelphia 5, USA, C/o Alexander Jecwan Udyog, Bombay.	..	1973-74	29,38,890	29,38,890	87,178	87,178

PART : C LIST OF PERSONS ON WHOM PENALTY OF NOT LESS THAN Rs.5000/- IS IMPOSED AND NO APPEAL IS PENDING DURING F.Y. 1973-74

Sl. No.	Name & Address of the assessee	Status	A.Y.	Amount
1.	Shri R.K. Maheshwari C/o Kumar Bros. Lisari Gate, Merrut.	Indl.	1970-71	7,500

वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 11 सितम्बर, 1974

का० आ० 2693—भारतीय लेखा परीक्षा तथा लेखा सेवा के अधिकारी श्री एन०सी० रावचौधरी ने, 19 मई, 1973 के अपराह्न को वित्तीय सलाहकार तथा मुख्य लेखा अधिकारी के पद का कार्यभार छोड़ा।

2. भारतीय लेखा परीक्षा तथा लेखा सेवा के अधिकारी श्री पी० के० दासगुप्ता को 16 अप्रैल, 1974 के अपराह्न से वित्तीय सलाहकार तथा मुख्य लेखा अधिकारी काय बोरें, कलकत्ता, के पद पर नियुक्त किया गया है।

[के-12014(3)/173-प्लांट(ए)]

एम० महादेव अय्यर, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

New Delhi, the 11th September, 1974

S.O. 2693.—Shri N. C. Rouchoudhuri, an officer of the Indian Audits and Accounts Service, relinquished charge of the post of Financial Adviser and Chief Accounts Officer, Tea Board, Calcutta, on the afternoon of the 19th May, 1973.

2. Shri P. K. Dasgupta, an officer of the Indian Audits and Accounts Service has been appointed as Financial Adviser and Chief Accounts Officer, Tea Board, Calcutta, with effect from the afternoon of the 16th April, 1974.

[K. 12014 (3)/73-Plant(A)]

S. MAHADEVA IYER, Under Secy.

आन्तरिक व्यापार विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 25 सितम्बर, 1974

का० आ० 2694—केन्द्रीय सरकार, महेश व्यापार भण्डार कम्पनी लिमिटेड, धुरी द्वारा मान्यता के नवीकरण के लिये अग्रिम सविदा (विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 74) की धारा 5 के अधीन दिये गये आवेदन पर, बायदा बाजार आयोग से परामर्श करके, विचार कर लेने पर, और अपना यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि ऐसा करना व्यापार के हित में और लोक हित में भी होगा, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुये उक्त कम्पनी को कपास की अग्रिम सविदाओं की बाबत 6 नवम्बर, 1974 से लेकर 5 नवम्बर, 1975 तक (जिसमें ये दोनों दिन सम्मिलित हैं) एक वर्ष की अतिरिक्त कालावधि के लिये मान्यता प्रदान करती है।

2. एतद्वारा प्रदत्त मान्यता इस शर्त के अध्वधीन है कि उक्त कम्पनी बायदा बाजार आयोग द्वारा समय समय पर दिये जाने वाले निर्देशों का अनुपालन करेगी।

[का सं० 12(15)-आई० टी०/74]

(Department of Internal Trade)

New Delhi, the 25th September, 1974

S.O. 2694.—The Central Government having considered in consultation with the Forward Markets Commission the application for renewal of recognition made under Section 5 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952) by the Mahesh Beopar Bhundar Co. Ltd., Dhuri and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do; hereby grants, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the said Act, recognition to the said Company for a further period of one year from the 6th November, 1974 to the 5th November, 1975 (both days inclusive) in respect of forward contracts in Kapas.

2. The recognition hereby granted, is subject to the condition that the said Company shall comply with such directions as may, from time to time, be given by the Forward Markets Commission.

[F. No. 12(15)-IT/74]

का० आ० 2695—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने बायदा बाजार आयोग से परामर्श करके इंडियन एक्सचेंज लिमिटेड, अमृतसर द्वारा अग्रिम सविदा (विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 74) की धारा 5 के अधीन मान्यता के नवीकरण के लिये आवेदन पर विचार करने पर, और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि ऐसा करना व्यापार के हित में और लोक हित में भी होगा, एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये उक्त एसोसियेशन को 11 नवम्बर, 1974 से 10 नवम्बर, 1975 तक (जिसमें दोनों दिन सम्मिलित हैं) को एक वर्ष की और कालावधि के लिये विनोद में अग्रिम सविदा की बाबत मान्यता प्रदान करती है।

2. एतद्वारा प्रदान की गई मान्यता इस शर्त के अधीन है कि उक्त एक्सचेंज ऐसे निर्देशों का अनुपालन करेगा जैसा कि बायदा बाजार आयोग द्वारा समय-समय पर दिये जायें।

[सं० का० 12(16)-आई० टी०/74]

यू० एम० राणा, संयुक्त निदेशक

S.O. 2695.—The Central Government having considered in consultation with the Forward Markets Commission the application for renewal of recognition made under Section 5 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952) by the Indian Exchange Limited, Amritsar, and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do, hereby grants, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the said Act, recognition to the said Association for a further period of one year from the 11th November, 1974 to the 10th November, 1975 (both days inclusive) in respect of forward contracts in Cottonseed.

2. The recognition hereby granted, is subject to the condition that the said Exchange shall comply with such directions as may, from time to time, be given by the Forward Markets Commission.

[F. No. 12(16)-IT/74]

U. S. RANA, Joint Director.

(मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 1974

का० आ० 2696—सर्वश्री इलेक्ट्रानिक कारपो० आफ इण्डिया लि०, इण्डस्ट्रियल डिबेलवैण्ट एरिया, चेन्नैपालली, हैदराबाद को 3,00,000 रुपये (तीन लाख रुपये मात्र) मूल्य का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं० आई/ए/1058749/सी/एक्स एक्स/46/एच/35-36 दिनांक 5-2-1973 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति की अनुमति जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। आगे यह बताया गया है कि मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति सीमाशुल्क कार्यालय, अम्बई में, पंजीकृत की गई थी।

इसका उपयोग किसी भी धनराशि के लिए नहीं किया गया था और 21-6-74 को इस पर 3,00,000 रुपये का उपयोग करना शेष था।

इस तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने नोटरी पब्लिक, लिबिल कार्टे, बम्बई के एक प्रमाण-पत्र के साथ सपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया है। तदनुसार मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि उक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति खो गई है। इसलिए, यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955, दिनांक 7-12-55 की उपधारा 9 (सी.सी.) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया, लि., हैदराबाद को जारी किए गए लाइसेंस सं० आई/ए/1058749/सी/एक्स एक्स/46/एच/35-36, दिनांक 5-2-73 की उक्त मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति एतद्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति की अनुलिपि लाइसेंस-धारी को अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[संख्या यू.डी.सी.ए/सी.ए-8/72-73-पी एल एम (ए)]

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CONTROLLER OF

IMPORTS & EXPORTS

ORDER

New Delhi, the 27th July, 1974

S.O. 2696.—M/s. Electronics Corp. of India Ltd Indl. Dev. Area, Cherlapalli Hyderabad were granted on import licence No. I/A/1058749/c/xx/46/H/35-36, dated 5-2-1973, for Rs. 3,00,000 (Rupees Three lakhs only). They have applied for the issue of a duplicate Customs Purposes copy of the said licence on the ground that the original Customs Purposes copy has been lost/misplaced. It is further stated that the original Customs Purposes copy was registered with the Customs authorities at Bombay. It was utilised for Rs. NIL and the balance available on it was Rs. 3,00,000 as on 21-6-1974.

2. In support of this contention the applicant has filed an affidavit along with a certificate from Notary Public A Civil Court, Bombay. I am accordingly satisfied that the original Customs Purposes copy of the said licence has been lost. Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred under Sub-clause 9(cc) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955, dated 7-12-1955 as amended the said original Customs Purposes copy of licence No. I/A/1058749/c/xx/46/H/35-36, dated 5-2-1973 issued to M/s. Electronics Corp. of India Ltd., Hyderabad is hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate Customs Purposes copy of the said licence is being issued separately to the licensee.

[No. UD/EC-8/72-73-PLS(A)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 मिनम्बर, 1974

का० प्रा० 2697.—मुख्य अभियन्ता, विद्युत मंत्रालय राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड बंगलौर को एक लाइसेंस सं० जी/ए/148768, दिनांक 25-2-1972 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने सूचना दी है कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति अस्थानस्थ हो गई है और इसकी अनुलिपि प्रति जारी करने लिए आवेदन किया है।

अपने तर्क की पुष्टि में आवेदक ने स्टाम्प पेपर पर एक वचन पत्र दिया है। अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि लाइसेंस की मुद्रा विनिमय

प्रति खो गई है और निवेश देती है कि लाइसेंस की उक्त मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि जारी की जाए।

लाइसेंस की मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति रद्द की गई है। उसकी अनुलिपि प्रति जारी की जा रही है।

[संख्या 3/एस जी/281/71-72 पी एल एस बी/657]

एस० के० उस्मानी, उपमुख्य नियंत्रक,
कृते मुख्य नियंत्रक

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th September, 1974

S.O. 2697.—Chief Engineer Electricity, Mysore State Electricity Board, Bangalore was granted licence No. G/A/1048768, dated 25-2-72. The Chief Engineer, Electricity; Mysore State Electricity Board, Bangalore has reported that the E.C. copy of the above mentioned licence has been misplaced and he has requested to issue duplicate copy of the same.

In support of their contention the applicant has given undertaking on the stamped paper. The undersigned is satisfied that the E.C. copy of the licence has been lost and directs that the duplicate copy of the said E.C. copy of the licence be issued.

The original E.C. copy of the licence has been cancelled. Duplicate E.C. copy of the same is being issued.

[No. 3/SG/281/71-72/PLSB/657]

S. K. USMANI, Dy. Chief Controller
for Chief Controller.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 27 मिनम्बर, 74

का० प्रा० 2698.—सर्वश्री स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया लिमिटेड, चन्द्रलोक, 36, जनपथ, नई दिल्ली का कच्चे माल (मिश्रित तथा अमिश्रित रूप में 56 एस तथा इससे कम सहित विशेष गुळ उन और कागज बनाने वाले विशेष सफलित रेशों) के आयात के लिए 25,30,000 रुपये मात्रा के लिए एक आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/बी/1400664/सी/एक्स एक्स/52/एच/37-38, दिनांक 10-7-1974 सर्वश्री पोरिट्रम एन्ड स्पेन्सर्स (एशिया) लि., नई दिल्ली के पक्ष में एक प्राधिकार पत्र के साथ प्रदान किया गया था।

2. उन्होंने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति दोनों की अनुलिपि प्रतियां जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति उनसे खो गई है या अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। लाइसेंसधारी द्वारा आगे यह सूचना दी गई है कि लाइसेंस का बिलकुल भी उपयोग नहीं किया गया था। लाइसेंस को किसी भी सीमाशुल्क प्राधिकरण से पंजीकृत भी नहीं कराया था।

3. अपने तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक सपथपत्र दाखिल किया है। अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/बी/1400664, दिनांक 10-7-74 की मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है या अस्थानस्थ हो गई है और निवेश देता है कि इसकी अनुलिपियां आवेदक को जारी की जानी चाहिए। मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति रद्द की जाती है।

4. लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपियां अलग से जारी की जा रही हैं।

[संख्या पेपर/8(2)/73-74/आर एम 2]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 27th September, 1974

S.O. 2698.—M/s. State Trading Corporation of India Limited, Chandralok, 36, Janpath, New Delhi were granted Import licence No. P/D/1400664/C/XX/52/H/37-38, dated 10th July, 1974, for import of Raw Materials (special scoured Wools in blended & unblended form including 56 S & below and special Paper Makers Synthetic Fibres) valued at Rs. 25,30,000 only, with a Letter of authority in favour of M/s. Porritis & Spencers (Asia) Ltd., New Delhi.

2. They have requested for the issue of duplicate copy of both Customs Purposes Copy and Exchange Control Purposes Copy of the above said licence on the ground that the original Customs Purposes Copy and Exchange Control Purposes Copy have been lost or misplaced by them. It has been further reported by the licensee that the licence had not been utilized at all. The licence had also not been registered with any Customs authority.

3. In support of their contention, the applicants have filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the original Customs Purposes Copy and Exchange Control Purposes Copy of Import Licence P/D/1400664, dated 10-7-1974 have been lost or misplaced and directs that Duplicate Customs Purposes Copy and Exchange Control Purposes Copy of the said licence should be issued to the applicant. The original Customs Purposes Copy and Exchange Control Purposes Copy are cancelled.

4. The Duplicate Customs Purposes Copy and Exchange Control Purposes Copy of the licence are being issued separately.

[No. Paper/8(2)/73-74/RM.II]

आवेश

नई दिल्ली, 4 अक्टूबर, 1974

क्रा० प्रा० 2699.—सर्वश्री कुमारधोबी फायरक्ले एंड सिलिका वर्क्स लि०, कलकत्ता को कच्चे परलाइट के आयात के लिए 1,30,000/- रुपये मूल्य का एक रिहाई आदेश संख्या पी०/डी०/आर०/006500, दिनांक 18-12-73 प्रदान किया गया था।

2. उन्होंने उपर्युक्त रिहाई आदेश की अनुलिपि प्रति जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल रिहाई आदेश उन से खो गया है या अज्ञानस्थ हो गया है। रिहाई आदेश धारक द्वारा यह भी सूचना दी गई है कि रिहाई आदेश पर 1,30,000/- रुपये का उपयोग करना बाकी था। रिहाई आदेश किसी भी सरणीबद्ध करने वाली एजेंसी में पंजीकृत नहीं किया गया था।

3. अपने तर्कों के समर्थन में आवेदकों ने एक शपथपत्र दखिल किया है। अधोवृत्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि रिहाई आदेश संख्या पी०/डी०/आर०/006500, दिनांक 18-12-73 को खो गया है या अज्ञानस्थ हो गया है और निदेश देने हैं कि इसकी अनुलिपि आवेदक को जारी की जानी चाहिए। मूल रिहाई आदेश रद्द किया जाता है।

4. रिहाई आदेश की अनुलिपि प्रति भ्रम से जारी की जा रही है।

[संख्या पी०/डी०/आर०/12/2/72-73/आरएम/2]

आई० बी० चुनकत, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

हुते मुख्य नियंत्रक

ORDER

New Delhi, the 4th October, 1974

S.O. 2699.—M/s. Kumardhubi Fireclay & Silica Works Ltd., Calcutta, were granted Release Order No. P/D/R/006500 on, 18-12-1973 for import of Raw Perlite valued at Rs. 1,50,00,000.

2. They have requested for the issue of duplicate Release Order of the above said Release Order on the ground that the original Release Order has been lost or misplaced by them. It has been further reported by the Release Order Holder that the Release Order had an unutilized balance of Rs. 1,30,000. The Release Order was not registered with any canning Agency.

3. In support of their contention, the applicants have filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the original Release order No. P/D/R/006500, dt. 18-12-1973 has been lost or misplaced and directs that a Duplicate Release Order of the said Release Order should be issued to the applicant. The original Release Order is cancelled.

4. The Duplicate copy of the Release is being issued separately.

[No. Pottery/12/2/72-73/RM. II]

I. V. CHUNKATH, Dy. Chief Controller
for Chief Controller

आवेश

बंगलूर, 13 अगस्त, 1974

क्रा० प्रा० 2700.—सर्वश्री पद्मा एन्टरप्राइजिज सं० 94, थ्यामगोन्डलु, नीलामंगला तालुक, जिला बंगलूर, कर्णाटक राज्य की सुगंधित रसायनों और प्राकृतिक संगंध तेल के आयात के लिये 5,000/- रुपये मूल्य का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी० एम० 1829133/सी०/एक्स एम्स/50/एम्स/37-38 दिनांक 6-3-74 प्रदान किया गया था। फर्म ने यह सूचना दी है कि उपर्युक्त आयात लाइसेंस उन्हें प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है और डाक प्राधिकारियों ने बताया है कि उक्त लाइसेंस डाक द्वारा भेजते समय खो गया था।

मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है और निदेश देता हूँ कि इन की अनुलिपि आवेदक को जारी की जानी चाहिए। उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति एल० द्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

[सं० आई० टी० सी० एम० एम० आई० ए० 481 ए० एम० 74 एन० पी०]

भार० जयराम नायडू, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

ORDER

Bangalore, the 13th August, 1974

S.O. 2700.—M/s. Sri Padma Enterprises, No. 94, Thyamagondlu, Nelamangala Taluk, Bangalore Distt. Karnataka State were granted import licence No. P.S. 1829133/C/XX/50/X/37-38, dated 6-3-1974 for Rs. 5,000 for import of Aromatic Chemicals and Natural Essential Oils. The firm have reported that they have not received the above import licence and the Postal Authorities have stated that the said article was lost during the course of transmission by post.

I am satisfied that the original Customs Purposes and Exchange Control Purposes copy of the above licence have been lost and direct a duplicate copy of Customs purposes and issued to the applicant. The original customs Purposes and Exchange control purposes copy of the above licence should be change Control Purposes copy of the above licence are hereby cancelled.

[No. ITC. SSI. A.481-AM-74-NP]

R. JAYARAM NAIDU, Dy. Chief Controller.

आवेश

बम्बई, 8 फरवरी, 1974

क्रा० प्रा० 2701.—सर्वश्री इंडियन जेम एंड पेपर प्रोडक्ट्स कॉर्पोरेशन, बम्बई-7 को अपरिष्कृत तथा बिना जड़े हुए हीरों 61-5 तथा गूल आयात प्रमाणिका के 5% तक भाग-2 253-4 के अन्तर्गत आने वाले

कीमती अपरिष्कृत तथा बिना उड़े हुये पत्थरो और 375 रु० के लिये ब्रिटिश सीमेड के आयात के लिये भी 33721 रु० का एक लाइसेंस सं० पी० के०/1353031 दिनांक 29-6-71 मंजूर किया गया था।

उन्होंने अब उक्त लाइसेंस की अनुमति सीमाशुल्क कार्यसम्बन्धी तथा मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रतियों के लिये इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल लाइसेंस खो गया/अस्थानस्थ हो गया है।

आगे यह बताया गया है कि सहायक सीमाशुल्क समाहर्ता के पत्र सं० एस०/27 ए०-62/72 ए० दिनांक 6-4-73 के अनुसार उक्त मूल लाइसेंस बम्बई सीमाशुल्क कार्यालय में पंजीकृत है और एग्जिमिनि बैंक भीदरलैंड ए० सी० बम्बई द्वारा तथा प्रमाणित देखे पत्र दिनांक 13-2-73 मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण में शेष 11,720.06 रुपये है जिनका उपयोग नहीं किया गया है।

अपने दावे के समर्थन में आवेदक ने रजिस्ट्रार एवं प्रेजीडेन्सी मैजिस्ट्रेट, एक्सचेंज कोर्ट बम्बई के सम्मुख विज्ञित शपथ लेने हुये 3.50 रुपये के स्टाम्प कागज पर एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है।

मैं मन्तुष्ट हूँ कि लाइसेंस सं० 1353031 दिनांक 29-6-71 की मूल सीमाशुल्क कार्यसम्बन्धी एवं मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रतियाँ खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई हैं और निदेश देता हूँ कि आवेदक को लाइसेंस की अनुमति प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिये।

[सं० एम० 2/81/427/ए० जे०-71/एस० सी०-6]

उ० सि० रायत,

उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

हुते मुख्य नियंत्रक।

ORDER

Bombay, the 8th February, 1974

S.O. 2701.—M/s. Indian Gem & Paper Products Corporation, Bombay-7 have been granted licence No. PK/1353031 dated 29-6-71 for Rs. 33721 for the import of Diamonds Uncut and Unset 61-V & within the overall import Replenishment up to 5 per cent for import of Precious Stones Uncut and Unset falling under Part 253-IV and also for the import of Brutting Cement for Rs. 375/-.

They have now applied for duplicate copies of Custom Purpose as well as Exchange Control of the said licence on the ground that the original licence has been lost/misplaced.

It is further stated that the said original licence is registered with the Bombay Customs as per letter No. S/27 A-62/72 L dated 6-4-73 from the Asstt. Collector of Customs, Bombay and unutilized balance on the Exchange Control Copy is Rs. 11,720.06 as certified by the Algemene Bank Nederland N. V., Bombay vide letter dated 13-2-73.

In support of their claim, applicant have filed an affidavit on Rs. 3.50/- dt. 26-9-73 Stamp Paper duly sworn before the Registrar and Presidency Magistrate, Explade Court, Bombay.

I am satisfied that the original copy of Custom Purpose and Exchange Control Copies of licence No. 1353031 dt. 29-6-71 have been lost/misplaced and direct that the duplicate of the licence should be issued to the applicant.

[No. S-2/81/427/AJ-71/SC-61]

D. D. SOUZA, Dy. Chief Controller
For Joint Chief Controller.

(केन्द्रीय लासेंस क्षेत्र)

आवेश

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 1974

का० धा० 2702—सर्वश्री यूनाइटेड इंजीनियरिंग एंटर प्राइजिज, 5-डी/8, रेलेवे रोड, कनोदाबाद को एम० एस० शीट कटिंग्स और सीधी लम्बाई में या गुणों में डिफेक्टिव शीट्स (सभी कोटिंग शीट्स और डिफेक्टिव को छोड़कर) के आयात के लिए 71,250/- रुपये मूल्य का एक रिहाई आवेदन सं० पी/एम/धार—485517 दिनांक 22-9-73 प्रदान किया गया था। 82 GI/74—4.

उन्होंने उक्त रिहाई आवेदन की अनुमति जारी करने के लिये इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल रिहाई आवेदन उपयोग किए बिना और हिन्दुस्तान स्टील लि० कार्यालय और भारत में अन्य कार्यालय में पंजीकृत कराए बिना खो गया/अस्थानस्थ हो गया है।

उत्पिक्त कथन के समर्थन में आवेदकों ने आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण नियम तथा क्रियाविधि हेन्डबुक, 1974-75 के पैरा 320 में यथा प्रपेक्षित एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि उक्त मूल रिहाई आवेदन खो गया/अस्थानस्थ हो गया है।

आयात नियंत्रण आवेदन 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 के खंड 9 (सी सी) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं उक्त मूल रिहाई आवेदन को रद्द करने का आदेश देता हूँ।

अब आवेदकों को आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण नियम तथा क्रिया विधि हेन्डबुक, 1974-75 के पैरा 320 (4) की शर्त के अनुसार 71,250/- रुपये मूल्य के पूर्ण रिहाई आवेदन की अनुमति प्रति जारी की जा रही है:

[संख्या: पी/यू-10 (एन) ए/एम० 73/ए यू० एच एच/सी एलए/

1865]

के० धार० धीर, उपमुख्य नियंत्रण

हुते संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक

ORDER

New Delhi, the 27th July, 1974

S.O. 2702.—M/s. United Engg. Enterprises, 5-D/8, Railway Road, Faridabad were granted release order no. P/S/R—485511 dated 22-9-73 for Rs. 71,250 for import of M.S. Sheet Cuttings and Defective Sheets in straight lengths or in coils (excluding all coated sheets and defectives).

They have applied for the issue of duplicate copy of the said R.O. on the ground that the original copy thereof has been lost/mis-placed without having been utilised and without having been registered with Hindustan Steel Ltd. office and other office in India.

The applicants had filed affidavit in support of the above statement as required under para 320 of I.T.C. Hand Book of Rules and Procedure 1974-75. I am satisfied that the original copy of the said R.O. has been lost mis-placed.

In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Section 9 (CC) of Import Control, 1955 dated 7-12-1955, I order the cancellation of the said original R.O.

The applicants are now being issued duplicate copy of the aforesaid R.O. for Rs. 71,250/- in accordance with the provision of para 320(4) of the I.T.C. Hand Book of Rules & Procedure, 1974-75.

[No. P/U-10/(N)/AM.73/AU.HH/CLA/1865]

K. R. DEER, Dy. Chief Controller.

for Joint Chief Controller

परमाणु ऊर्जा विभाग

आवेश

बम्बई, 20 सितम्बर, 1974

का० धा० 2703.—राष्ट्रपति केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियम, 1965 के नियम 9 के उप-नियम (2), नियम 12 के उप-नियम (2) खंड (ख) और नियम 24 के उप-नियम (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये एतद्वारा निदेश देते हैं कि दिनांक 27 नवम्बर, 1971 के भारत के राजपत्र के भाग 2 खंड 3, उप-खंड (ii) में प्रकाशित परमाणु ऊर्जा विभाग के का० धा० 5187 दिनांक 3 सितम्बर, 1970 द्वारा जारी भारत सरकार के आदेश में निम्नलिखित संशोधन किया जाये, नामतः

- (1) "भाग II—साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा, वर्ग-III में, मद् (iii) तथा उसके अन्तर्गत की गई प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्न-लिखित प्रविष्टियाँ प्रतिस्थापित की जायें, नामतः:
- (iii) "प्रशासनिक वरिष्ठ प्रशासन वरिष्ठ सभी निदेशक, परमाणु एवं तकनीकी एवं लेखा प्रशासन एवं खनिज प्रभाग";
पद अधिकारी लेखा अधिकारी 5
- (2) "भाग-III-प्राथमिक केन्द्रीय सेवा, वर्ग iv में, मद् (iii), तथा उसके अन्तर्गत की गई प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्न-लिखित प्रविष्टियाँ प्रतिस्थापित की जायें, नामतः—
- (iii) "प्रशासनिक वरिष्ठ प्रशासन वरिष्ठ प्रशासन सभी निदेशक परमाणु एवं तकनीकी एवं लेखा एवं लेखा-खनिज प्रभाग
पद अधिकारी कारी

[संख्या 22(1)/88-प्रशासन/1795]

एस० के० चौधरी, अधर सचिव

(Department of Atomic Energy)

ORDER

Bombay, the 20th September, 1974

S.O. 2703.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 9, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 12 and sub-rule (1) of rule 24 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965, the President hereby directs that the following amendments shall be made in the Order of the Government of India in the Department of Atomic Energy No. S.O. 5187, dated the 3rd December, 1970, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, sub-section (ii), dated the 27th November, 1971, namely :—

(1) in "Part II-General Central Service, Class III",—for item (iii) and the entries relating thereto, the following entries shall be substituted namely :—

(iii) Administrative and Technical posts.	Senior Administrative and Accounts Officer	Senior Administrative and Accounts Officer	All	Director Atomic Minerals Division";
---	--	--	-----	-------------------------------------

(2) in part III—General Central Service, Class IV, for item (iii) and the entries relating thereto, the following entries shall be substituted, namely :—

(iii) Administrative and Technical posts.	Senior Administrative and Accounts Officer	Senior Administrative and Accounts Officer	All	Director, Atomic Minerals Division".
---	--	--	-----	--------------------------------------

[No. 22(1)/68-Adm./1795]

S. K. CHAUDHARY,

Under Secy.

शिक्षा तथा समाज कल्याण मंत्रालय

(शिक्षा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 1 अक्टूबर, 1974

क्र० आ० 2704.—हैदराबाद विश्वविद्यालय अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 39) की धारा-1 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रवर्तित अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम लागू होने की तारीख 2 अक्टूबर, 1974 निर्धारित करती है।

[सं० एफ 14-3/74 लेजि० युनिट]

के० एन० चन्ना, सचिव,

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL WELFARE
(Department of Education)

New Delhi, the 1st October, 1974

S.O. 2704.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 1 of the University of Hyderabad Act,

1974 (39 of 1974) the Central Government hereby appoint the 2nd October, 1974 as the date on which the said Act shall come into force.

[No. F. 14-3/74-Leg. Unit]

K. N. CHANNA, Secy.

कार्यालय महानिदेशक नागर विमानन

नई दिल्ली, तारीख 7 अक्टूबर, 1974

क्र० आ० 2703.—सांविधिक आदेश—विमान नियमावली 1937 के नियम 78-क का अनुपालन करने हुए महानिदेशक नागर विमानन उक्त नियम के उपनियम (1) के प्रयोजनार्थ नीचे खींची गयी सारणी के खाना 1 में निर्दिष्ट क्षेत्र एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करते हैं और उसके तदनुसंगी खाना 2 और 3 में उल्लिखित राशि ऐसी राशि के रूप में निर्दिष्ट करने हैं जिसका भुगतान करने पर उक्त क्षेत्र में प्रवेश करने के लिए एक प्रवेश टिकट प्राप्त किया जा सकता है।

सारणी

क्षेत्र का विवरण	प्रत्येक प्रवेश टिकट निम्न आधार पर प्रत्येक के लिए देय राशि	मिनट कालिक टिकट के लिए देय राशि	मासिक	त्रैमासिक छमाही
1	2	3	रुपए	रुपए
जयपुर और ब्रह्मदाबाद स्थित सरकारी विमान क्षेत्र में यात्री बुकिंग हॉल और लीज तथा उनसे संबंधित स्थान	1	30	90	180

2. यह अधिसूचना पत्नी नवम्बर, 1974 से लागू होगी।

[सं० ए० बी० 11013/5/73-रेवेन्यू]

एस० रामासुब्रम,
महानिदेशक

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF CIVIL

AVIATION

New Delhi, the 1st October, 1974

S.O. 2705.—In pursuance of rule 78-A of the Aircraft Rules, 1937 the Director General of Civil Aviation hereby notifies the area specified in column 1 of the Table below for the purposes of sub-rule (1) of the said rule and specifies the amount mentioned in the corresponding entries in columns 2 and 3 thereof as the amount on the payment of which an admission ticket may be obtained for entry into the said area.

TABLE

Description of area	Amount payable for each admission ticket	Amount payable for each seasonal ticket on
		Monthly 'Quarterly' 'Half' 'basis' basis yearly basis
1	2	3
Passenger booking halls and lounges and the inclosures appertaining there to in the Government aerodromes at Jaipur and Ahmedabad	Rs. 1 Rs. 30	Rs. 90 Rs. 180

2 This notification shall come into force with effect from 1st November, 1974

[No AV. 11,013/5/73 Rev.]

S RAMAMURTHI, Director General

निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 27 सितम्बर, 1974

का० प्रा० 2706.—सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेवशर्ती) अधिनियम 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 3628, तारीख 29 दिसम्बर, 1973 का अधिकांश करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत सरकार के पूर्व निर्माण, आवास और पूर्ति मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 307, तारीख 28 जनवरी, 1959 में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्—

उक्त अधिसूचना के नीचे की सारणी में क्रम सं० 4 के सामने सप्तम 1 में, धन में निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि जोड़ी जाएगी, अर्थात्—

“श्री धार० सी० सक्सेना, सहायक विधि सलाहकार, विधि न्याय और कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय नई दिल्ली।”

[का० सं० 21012(3)/74-नोति-III]

पी० एम० एल० शर्मा, अपर संपदा निदेशक और पदेन उप सचिव,

MINISTRY OF WORKS AND HOUSING

New Delhi, the 27th September, 1974

S.O. 2706.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Min. of Works and Housing No. S.O. 3628 dated the 29th December, 1973 the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India, in the late Ministry of Works housing, and Supply No. S.O. 307 dated the 28th January, 1959, namely.

In the Table below the said notification against serial No. 4, in column 1 the following entry shall be added at the end, namely

“Shri R. C. Saksena, Assistant Legal Adviser, Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, New Delhi”

(File No. 21012(3)/74 Pol. III)

P. S. L. SHARMA Addl. Director of estates and Ex-officio Dy. Secy

संचार मंत्रालय

(डाक-तार बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 1974

का० प्रा० 2707.—भारतीय डाक अधिनियम, 1898 (1898 का 6) की धारा 8 और 21 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय डाकधर नियम, 1933 में और संशोधन करने के लिये निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्—

1- (1) इस नियमों का नाम भारतीय डाकधर (मातृ संशोधन) नियम, 1974 है।

(2) ये 1974 के नवम्बर के प्रथम दिन का प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2- भारतीय डाकधर नियम, 1933 में—

(क) नियम 1-क का खोप किया जाएगा,

(ख) नियम 5-ख का खोप किया जाएगा,

(ग) नियम 15 और उस नियम के शीर्षक का खोप किया जाएगा।

[संख्या 41/14/72 सी.प्रा.]

श्रीमती जी० ई० बनर्जी, निदेशक डाक (तकनीकी)

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATION

(Posts and Telegraphs Board)

New Delhi, the 30th September, 1974

S.O. 2707.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sections 8 and 21 of the Indian Post Office Act, 1898 (6 of 1898) the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Indian Post Office Rules 1933 namely—

1 (1) These rules may be called the Indian Post Office (seventh Amendment) Rules, 1974

2 In the Indian Post Office Rules, 1933

2 In the Indian Post Office Rules, 1933

(a) Rule 1-A shall be omitted,

(b) Rule 5-B shall be omitted

(c) Rule 15 and the heading to that rule shall be omitted

[No. 41/14/72-CJ]

Shrimati G. E. BANERJI, Director Postal (Technical)

मिन्सॉई और विद्युत मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 25 सितम्बर, 1974

का० प्रा० 2708.—विजली (सप्लाई) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 54वां) की धारा 3 में प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा इस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या बि०-28(8)/72, दिनांक 13 जनवरी, 1974 तथा 14 मई, 1974 द्वारा यथा संशोधित इस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या बि०-28(8)/72 दिनांक 13 जून, 1973 का प्रांशिक संशोधन करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री एन० टाटा राज के स्थान पर श्री एन० प्रा० कुलकर्णी, सदस्य (ताप) केन्द्रीय जल और विद्युत आयोग (विद्युत स्कंध) का और श्री पी० बी० सुब्रह्मण्यन के स्थान पर श्री ए० पी० राय, मयुक्त सचिव एवं विधि सलाहकार, विधि, न्याय तथा कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय, विधि कार्य विभाग का केन्द्रीय विजली प्राधिकरण के सदस्य नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या बि०-28(8)/72]

मन्मो खन्ना गग, प्रवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER

New Delhi, the 25th September, 1974

S.O. 2708.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 (54 of 1948) and in partial modification of this Ministry's notification No. EL II-28(8)/72 dated the 13th June, 1973 and modified vide this Ministry's Notification No. EL II 28(8)/72 dated the 15th January, 1974 and 14th May, 1974, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri H. R. Kulkarni, Member (Thermal), Central Water and Power Commission (Power Wing) as a Member of the Central Electricity Authority vice Shri N. Tata Rao, and Shri A. P. Roy, Joint Secretary & Legal Adviser, Ministry of Law Justice and Company Affairs, Department of Legal Affairs, vice Shri P. B. Venkatasubramanian

[No. EL II 28(8)/72]

L. C. GARG, Under Secy

अस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 1974

का० प्रा० 2709.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 14) की धारा 1 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा अक्टूबर, 1974 के 13वें

धन को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के ध्येय 4 (धारा 44 और 45 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी हैं) और ध्येय 5 और 6 (धारा 76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा 77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी हैं) के उपबन्ध केवल राज्य में त्रिपुरा जिले त्रिचुर तालुक में, किलानूर के राजस्व गाँव के सीमान्तर्गत क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे।

[सं.एस.-38013/23/74-एल.आर.]

आर० पी० नरुला, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 5th October, 1974

S.O. 2709.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 13th day of October, 1974 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapters V and VI (except sub-section (1) of section 76 and Sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of the said Act shall come into force in the areas within the Revenue village of Kilanoor, in Trichur Taluk in the Trichur District in the State of Kerala

[No S. 38013/23/74-HI]

R P. NARULA, Under Secy

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 1974

का० आ० 2710.—यत केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि लोक हित में ऐसा अपेक्षित था, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (ड) के उपखण्ड (vi) के परन्तुक के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में एक अधिसूचना भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1018 तारीख 8 अप्रैल, 1974 द्वारा यूरेनियम उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 20 अप्रैल, 1974 से छ मास की कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया था,

और यत केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकहित में उक्त कालावधि को छ मास की और कालावधि के लिए बढ़ाया जाना अपेक्षित है,

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (ड) के उपखण्ड (vi) के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 20 अक्टूबर, 1974 से छ मास की और कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करती है।

[का० सं० एस-11025/13/74-एल० आर० 1]

New Delhi, the 30th September, 1974

S.O. 2710.—Whereas the Central Government being satisfied that the public interest so required had declared by a notification made in pursuance of the provisions of the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), being the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No S O 1018 dated the 8th April, 1974 the service in the uranium industry, to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act for a period of six months from the 20th April, 1974,

And whereas the Central Government is of opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period by a further period of six months;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act for a further period of six months from the 20th October, 1974.

[F No S. 11025/13/74-LR. I]

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 1974

का० आ० 2711.—यत भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वसि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1970, दिनांक 28 मई, 1968 द्वारा गठित श्रम न्यायालय संख्या 2 बम्बई के पीठासीन अधिकारी का पद रिक्त हो गया है,

अतः, अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 8 द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1365, दिनांक 27 मई, 1974 का प्राथमिक संशोधन करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री बी० रामलाल किशन को उक्त श्रम न्यायालय के पीठासीन अधिकारी के रूप में भी नियुक्त करती है।

[का० सं० एस०-11025/33/74-एल० आर०-1(i)]

New Delhi, the 5th October, 1974

S.O. 2711.—Whereas, a vacancy has occurred in the office of the presiding officer of the Labour Court No. 2 at Bombay constituted by the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour & Employment) No. SO 1970 dated the 28th May, 1968;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 8 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), and in partial modification of the notification No. SO 1365, dated the 27th May, 1974 the Central Government hereby appoints Shri B Ramlal Kishan as the presiding officer of the said Labour Court also.

[No F. S. 11025/33/74-LR. I.(i)]

का० आ० 2712.—यत भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वसि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1971, दिनांक 28 मई, 1968 द्वारा गठित औद्योगिक प्रतिकारण संख्या 2 बम्बई के पीठासीन अधिकारी का पद रिक्त हो गया है;

अतः अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 8 द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1364, दिनांक 27 मई, 1974 का प्राथमिक संशोधन करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री बी० रामलाल किशन को उक्त औद्योगिक प्रतिकारण के पीठासीन अधिकारी के रूप में भी नियुक्त करती है।

[का० सं० एस०-11025/33/74-एल० आर०-(i)(ii)]

एस० एस० सहस्रनामन, अवर सचिव

S.O. 2712.—Whereas, a vacancy has occurred in the office of the presiding officer of the Industrial Tribunal No 2 at Bombay constituted by the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No S O. 1971 dated the 28th May, 1968;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 8 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), and in partial modification of the notification No SO 1364, dated the 27th May, 1974 the Central Government hereby appoints Shri B Ramani Kishen as the presiding officer of the said Industrial Tribunal also

[No S 11025/33/74 LRI(n)]

S S SAHASRAMAN, Under Secy

New Delhi, the 28th September, 1970

S.O. 2713—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Arbitrator on the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Chowgule and Company Private Limited (Mechanical Ore Handling Plant) Mormugao Harbour (Goa) and their workmen as represented by Goa Dock Labour Union, Vasco-da-Gama (Goa) which was received by the Central Government on the 23rd September, 1974

BEFORE SHRI N K VANI ARBITRATOR

[Ref No CGIT-2/ARB/1 of 1974

Parties —

Employers in relation to the management of
Messrs Chowgule & Co Pvt Ltd,
(Mechanical Ore Handling Plant),
Mormugao Harbour (Goa)

and

their workmen represented by Goa Dock Labour Union
Post Box 87, Sambhaji (Vasco-da-Gama), Goa

APPEARANCES —

For the employers—Shri D P Sinha, Labour Officer
For the workmen—No appearance
Industry—Port and Docks
State—Goa, Daman and Diu
Bombay, dated the 6th September, 1974

AWARD

By order No L-36011/1/74-P&D dated the 22nd March, 1974 the present dispute has been referred to my arbitration by an agreement under Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as mentioned below —

"AGREEMENT UNDER SECTION 10A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947

BETWEEN

Names of the parties —

Representing Employers—Shri P B R Rao General Manager M/s Chowgule & Co Pvt Ltd, (Mechanical Ore Handling Plant), Mormugao Harbour (Goa)

Representing Workmen—Shri R V Gaundalker Asstt. Secretary Goa Dock Labour Union, Post Box 87, Sambhaji (Vasco-da-Gama), Goa

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following dispute to the arbitration of Shri N K Vani, Central Government Industrial Tribunal II, Bombay

(i) Specific matters in dispute

- 1 Whether the action of the management of M/s Chowgule & Co Pvt Ltd, Mormugao Harbour (Goa) in lying off their workmen of the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant at Mormugao Harbour from 15th December, 1973 to 20th December, 1973 (both days inclusive) was legal and justified,

If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled?

- 2 Whether the stoppage of work resorted to by the workmen of the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant, Mormugao Harbour (Goa) of M/s Chowgule & Co Pvt Ltd, from 21st December, 1973 till the date they resumed normal work was legal and justified?

(ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved

(a) M/s Chowgule & Co Pvt Ltd, Mormugao Harbour (Goa) (Mechanical Ore Handling Plant)

(b) Goa Dock Labour Union, Post Box 87, Sambhaji (Goa)

(iii) Name of the workmen in case he himself is involved in the dispute or the name of the Union, if any, representing the workmen or workmen in question Goa Dock Labour Union, Post Box 87, Sambhaji (Goa)

(iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected 350 (approx)

(v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected 350 (approx)

We further agree that the decision of the arbitrator shall be binding on us

The arbitrator shall make his Award within a period of 90 days or within such further time as is extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period aforesaid, the reference to arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration

Signature of the parties

Representing the employer Sd/- P B R RAO 10/1/74

Representing the workmen Sd/- R V GAUNDALKER

10/1/74

Witness

1 Sd/- F X DCRUS

2 Sd/- I R D'MELLO

Dated - 10-1-1974

I accept to arbitrate in this industrial dispute

Sd/-

N K VANI Arbitrator

Central Government

Industrial Tribunal No II, B'bay

2 On the receipt of the dispute, notices were issued to the parties to file statement of claim and written statement, but they failed to do so

3 As the period of 90 days for giving award expired, both the parties by their letter dated 30-7-1974 (Ex 1/EW) agreed to extend the time limit for the completion of the arbitration proceedings by another 90 days with effect from the date the first 90 days were over

4 By notice dated 13-8-1974 both the parties were directed to file Claim Statement, Written Statement, Documents, etc on or before 24-8-1974. They were also informed that the hearing would be held at 11.30 A.M. on Saturday the 31st August, 1974 in the Court Room

5 The claim statement/written statement were not filed on or before 24-8-1974. On 31-8-1974 nobody on behalf of Goa Dock Labour Union representing the employees remained present. Labour Officer on behalf of M/s Chowgule & Co Pvt Ltd (hereinafter referred to as the company) appeared before me and filed affidavit at Ex 3/G along with application Ex 2/E. He has also produced copy of Standing Orders

6. Points for consideration are as follows :—

- (i) Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Chowgule & Co. Pvt. Ltd., Mormugao Harbour (Goa) in laying off their workmen of the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant at Mormugao Harbour from 15th December, 1973 to 20th December, 1973 (both days inclusive) was legal and justified?
- (ii) If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled?
- (iii) Whether the stoppage of work resorted to by the workmen of the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant, Mormugao Harbour (Goa) of M/s. Chowgule & Co. Pvt. Ltd. from 21st December, 1973 till the date they resumed normal work was legal and justified?
- (iv) What order?

7. My findings are as follows :—

- (i) Yes.
- (ii) Does not survive.
- (iii) No.
- (iv) As per order.

REASONS

Point Nos. i to iv.

8. At the outset it may be noted that Goa Dock Labour Union representing the employees has remained absent on the date of hearing. It has not adduced any evidence.

9. The company's Labour Officer Shri D. P. Sinha has filed affidavit at Ex. 3/E, mentioning the facts as mentioned below :—

- “(i) The plant was started by the Company at the berth Nos. 6 & 7 of the Mormugao Harbour in April 1959. The major function it performs are discharging the loaded barges which come to the Plant by stream from the mining areas and stacking the ores so discharged on its yard. When the outgoing vessels/ships are on its berth, the Plant loads by mechanical device the iron ore stacked on its yard, by the process of conveyor belts. When the outgoing vessel is on its berth, it also simultaneously loads it from the barge without stacking the ore from the barge in its yard.
- (ii) The Plant is mainly devised so as to handle the cargo arriving through navigation and stacking/loading it as per the requirement. The working of the Plant is mainly dependent upon the movement of the barges which bring bulk of the cargo to be handled by the Plant.
- (iii) Iron ore which is handled by the Plant for the purposes of being exported by ships to foreign countries are of different varieties, viz., iron ore pellets, lumpy ore, calibrated ore and fines (a variety of ore). As each variety of the iron ore is a distinct item of export, arrangements have been made in the yard of the Plant to stack these different categories of ore separately.
- (iv) Inflow of cargo to the plant is primarily through barges and, therefore, the Plant is rendered completely idle when for some reason or the other barges are not bringing ore to the Plant. Even at such junctures, if there is some cargo in the yard of the Plant already stacked, the same can be loaded by the Plant in the outgoing vessel provided it is a ship-load in a particular variety, to be exported.
- (v) The working of the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant is a service connected with the working of major port or dock and is, therefore, a public utility service under Section 2(n)(ia) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
- (vi) The bargecrew of the company started working from sunrise to sunset from 1st December 1973 thereby the inflow of cargo at the plant during the hours from sunset to sunrise of the next day was nil. This mode of working of the barges continued till

11th of December 1973 from which day from 12 O'clock in the noon the bargecrew went on a total strike. From the same time, i.e. 12 O'clock on 11th December 1973 the bargecrew of other Companies of the territory also went on a total strike in sympathy of the sad incidence of sinking of barge 'Rajan' of Messrs. India Shipping Company with consequent death of its master and 3 dock workers. This strike of the bargecrew of the territory continued till 5.00 p.m. on 14th December 1973 when the bargecrew of the other companies resumed work and started plying the barges. Unfortunately, the barges of this company did not resume work and continued their illegal and unjustified strike. Efforts were made by the company to explain to the bargecrew that their stand is not proper but with no result.

- (vii) Due to the partial strike of the bargecrew, the workmen of the plant were rendered idle continuously from 1st December till 11th December 1973 every day from 6.00 p.m. to 6.00 a.m. From 12th December 1973, as a result of the total strike by the bargecrew, the workmen of the plant were rendered totally idle. In view of the failure of negotiations with the bargecrew on the morning of 15th December 1973, the company was forced to reconsider of continued idling of the workmen of the Plant. The Company contacted the other 2 users of the plant, viz., Messrs. Salgaocans and Messrs. Dempos and understood from them that they were not expected to divert any barges or steamer to the plant at least for the next about one week.
- (viii) In view of the above, it became evident that no cargo will be available from 15th December, 1973 onwards. The Management, therefore, finally took the decision to lay-off all the workmen of the plant with effect from the II shift on Saturday the 15th December 1973, i.e. commencing from 15 hours.
- (ix) On 17th morning, the company could succeed in its efforts of getting some cargo to the plant by hired barges (800 tons per day) and, therefore in view of the expected arrival of the cargo, the company lifted the lay-off partially, i.e. for the I shift on 18th and 20th (19th being a holiday) although the discharging capacity of the plant is 2500 tons per shift. In the meantime the company was informed by Messrs. V. S. Dempo and Co. Pvt. Ltd., that they are expecting a steamer to arrive on the night of 20th December 1973 and as such the company lifted the lay-off totally with effect from 21st December, 1973.
- (x) Decisions of lay-off as well as lifting of lay-off were notified to the workers by display of notices on the Notice-Boards of the Plant on 15th and 17th December, 1973 respectively. The I shift workmen of the Plant did not report for work on 18th December 1973.
- (xi) The Goa Dock Labour Union vide its letter dated 15-12-73 raised a dispute alleging that the lay-off was illegal and requested the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Vasco-da-Gama that the matter be admitted in conciliation. Accordingly, a meeting was called on 18-12-73 in the evening at 4.30 p.m. The company explained the circumstances and also informed that the lay-off having been partially lifted from 18th December and totally from 21st December 1973, the workmen should be advised to resume work at least from 20th December 1973 (19th December was holiday). The Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Vasco-da-Gama, Advised the Union representatives that irrespective of the lay-off being legal or illegal which question would be taken up in conciliation, the workmen may resume work on 20th December.
- (xii) In spite of the above advice, the workmen did not report for duty in the I shift on 20th December & in all shifts from 21st December 1973.

(xiii) The above facts were intimated to the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Vasco-da-Gama and the Conciliation Officer in time and a meeting was convened by him on 25-12-73 where the Union reiterated its allegations that the lay-off was illegal and as such the workmen were not willing to resume duty unless the company mark all the workers present and assured payment of the wages in full. In spite of the advice given by the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Vasco-da-Gama, even on 22-12-73, the workmen did not report for work and continued with their allegations that the lay-off is illegal and that the workers should be marked present and assured payment of the wages in full. The Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Vasco-da-Gama, subsequently vide his letter No. V-13(16)/73/2, dated the 22-12-73 requested the General Secretary of the Union to advise the workmen to resume their duties in view of the fact that the Management had lifted the lay-off partly on 18th and 20th December and totally from 21st December 1973 onwards.

(xiv) In spite of the written advice given by the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Vasco-da-Gama, the workers did not report for work and the position continued until 10-1-74 when the parties agreed to refer the dispute to the arbitration. The normalcy at the plant was brought about from 11.1.74.

(xv) It is the contention of the company that the lay-off effected on 15-12-73 (2 shifts), 17-12-73 (all the 3 shifts), 28-12-73 and 20-12-73 (2 shifts) was justified and legal.

(xvi) Action of the workmen of the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant by resorting to stoppage of work by not reporting for duty on 18th December 1 shift, 20th December 1 shift and from 21st December 1973 completely amounted to a strike as defined under the I.D. Act, 1947. The workmen had not given any notice of the strike and as such their above action of not reporting to work amounts to an illegal strike, because the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant is a public utility service under the I.D. Act, 1947. Even presuming for the sake of arguments that the lay-off is illegal, it does not justify their action which under the law is an illegal strike.

(xvii) As the lay-off effected in the plant was due to the illegal strike resorted by the bargecrew of the company, the company is not liable to pay any compensation for the period of lay-off effected by it in the plant.

(xviii) The certified standing order No.14(3) applicable to the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant, states as under:—

"In case where employees are laid off for short periods on account of failure of plant, temporary curtailment of activities, etc., the period of unemployment shall be treated as compulsory leave with or without pay, as the case may be. Where, however, the employees have to be laid off for long period, their services may be terminated after giving them notice or pay in lieu thereof."

(xix) The company has accordingly treated the workers on-leave for the period 15-12-73, 17-12-73, 18-12-73 and 20-12-73 on leave with or without wages (depending upon leave to the credit of individual workman).

10. The definition of 'lay-off' is given in Section 2(kkk) of the I.D. Act, 1947. According to this definition, 'lay-off' means the failure, refusal or inability of an employer on account of shortage of coal power or raw materials or the accumulation of stocks or the breakdown of machinery or for any other reasons to give employment to a workman whose name is borne on the muster rolls of his industrial establishment and who has not been retrenched.

11. In the present case it is clear from the affidavit of Shri Sinha referred to above that it was not possible for the company to give work to the employees working in the plant as barges were not bringing ore to the plant and as it was not possible to get ore from some other source.

12. As no cargo was available for handling at the plant, the company had no other alternative but to take decision to lay-off all the workman of the plant w.e.f. 15th December, 1973.

13. On 17th morning the company could succeed in its efforts, in getting some cargo to the plant by hired barges. It therefore lifted the lay-off partially, i.e., for the 1 shift on 18th and 20th (19th being a holiday). As the company was expecting a steamer to arrive on the night of 20th December 1973, it lifted the lay-off totally w.e.f. 21-12-73.

14. It appears that the decisions of lay-off as well as lifting of lay-off taken by co. were notified to the workers by display of notices on the Notice Boards of the plant on 15th and 17th December 1973, respectively.

15. In short, it is clear from the affidavit filed by Shri Sinha referring to various circumstances which forced the company to lay-off the workmen of the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant, Mormugao Harbour, that the action of the Company in laying off their workmen from 15-12-73 to 20-12-73 was just, proper and legal.

16. In the present case lay-off was for short period. Hence as per Standing Order No. 14(3) applicable to Mechanical Ore Handling Plant, the period of employment has to be treated as compulsory leave with or without pay as the case may be. The company has accordingly treated the workers on leave for the period 15-12-73, 17-12-73, 18-12-73 and 20-12-73 with or without wages depending upon individual workman.

17. As the lay-off was just and legal the workmen in question are not entitled to any relief.

18. It is clear from affidavit of Shri Sinha referred to above that the working of the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant is a service connected with the working of major port or dock and is, therefore a public utility service under Section 2(n) (ia) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

19. The company lifted the lay-off completely from 21-12-73, but the employees working in plant did not resume duty.

20. Goa Dock Labour Union, vide its letter dated 15-12-73 raised a dispute alleging that the lay-off was illegal and requested the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Vasco-da-Gama that the matter be admitted in conciliation. The ALC called the meeting on 18-12-73 in the evening at 4.30 p.m. In that meeting he advised the Union representatives that irrespective of the fact, whether the lay-off is legal or illegal, the workmen may resume work on 20-12-73 as the management has already partially lifted the lay-off on 20-12-73 and from 21st December, 1973 fully. In spite of this advice, workmen did not report for duty. The Assistant Labour Commissioner was informed accordingly. He again called the meeting on 22-12-73. In spite of the repeated advice given by ALC to resume duty, the workmen did not report for work.

21. The Assistant Labour Commissioner by his letter No. V-13(16)/73/2 dated 22-12-73 requested the General Secretary of the Union to advise the workmen to resume their duties in view of the fact that the Management had lifted the lay-off partly on 18th and 20th December and totally from 21st December, 1973 onwards. In spite of this letter, the workers did not resume duty. This position continued till 10-1-74 when the parties agreed to refer the dispute to arbitration.

22. There can be no doubt that workers did not resume duty till 10-1-74.

23. In the present case the workers had not given any notice of strike as required under Section 22 of the I.D. Act, as the plant is the public utility service.

24. As the worker had not given notice of the strike their action of not reporting to work amounts to an illegal strike.

25. I therefore hold the stoppage of work resorted to by the workmen of the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant Mormugao Harbour (Goa) of M/s. Chowgule & Co. Pvt. Ltd. from 21st December, 1973 till the date they resumed normal work was illegal and not justified.

26. In view of the above findings, I pass the following order:—

ORDER

- (i) It is hereby declared that the action of the Management of M/s. Chowgule & Co. Pvt. Ltd., Mormugao Harbour (Goa) in laying off their workmen of the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant at Mormugao Harbour from 15th December, 1973 to 20th December, 1973 was legal and justified and that these workmen are not entitled to any relief.
- (ii) It is hereby declared that stoppage of work resorted to by the workmen of the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant, Mormugao Harbour (Goa) of M/s. Chowgule & Co. Pvt. Ltd. from 21st December, 1973 till the date they resumed normal work was not legal and justified.
- (iii) Arbitration award is made accordingly.
- (iv) No order as to costs.

N. K. VANI, Arbitrator/
Presiding Officer

[No. L.36011/1/74-P&D/CMT.]

New Delhi, the 30th September, 1974

S.O. 2714.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Beas Dam Project, Talwara and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 23rd September, 1974.

BEFORE SHRI H. R. SODHI, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL), CHANDIGARH.

Reference No. 10/C of 1973.

Between the workmen and the management of Beas Dam Project, Talwara.

APPEARANCE:

Shri K. K. Jaagia along with Shri Padamjit Singh for the respondent management.

Shri Daulat Singh Chohan for the workmen

AWARD

There is a Fire-fighting Service at Beas Dam Project, Talwara, Distt. Hoshiarpur, maintained by the administration of the said Project. It appears that for sometime the firemen employed on this job used to work in a shift system but the same was subsequently abolished. The exact dates have not been stated in the present proceedings. The management started paying to employees of the Fire-fighting service a call allowance varying from Rs. 25/- to Rs. 30/- per month over and above their normal wages w.e.f. 1st January, 1970. The workmen after having received such an allowance for almost two years raised a demand through a demand notice asking the management to pay such allowance retrospectively w.e.f. 1-6-1965 when the alleged shift system was abolished. Since the conciliation proceedings failed to resolve the dispute amicably parties applied through a joint application, Ext. R/2, in Reference No. 11/C of 1973, under section 10(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act for a Reference being made for adjudication by a Tribunal. It was on this application that the Central Government being satisfied that the Workmen's Union, Beas Dam Project, described hereinafter as the Union, represented majority of the concerned workmen made a reference, published in the Central Government Gazette, to this Tribunal in exercise of the powers conferred on it by Section 7A and sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The matter referred is:

Whether the employees employed in the Fire Fighting Service at Beas Dam Project, Talwara, District Hoshiarpur are entitled to the payment of Call Allowance from 1st June, 1965 to 31st December, 1969 at the same rates at which they are being paid with effect from 1st January 1970? If not, to what relief are they entitled?

Notices were issued to the parties. The union preferred its claim wherein it is pleased that the staff is called upon to do additional jobs like telephone attendance etc. and that it was for this purpose that Call Allowance was introduced. The plea of the workmen further is that the basis on which Call Allowance was sanctioned was in existence from 1-6-65 onwards and the workmen are therefore, entitled to this allowance from that date. The management resisted the claim and raised even preliminary objections. On the pleadings of the parties following issues were framed:—

Preliminary issue

Whether the reference is bad in law and without jurisdiction for the preliminary objections stated in paras 1 & 2 of the written statement, wherein the reasons given are that the application and statement for joint reference were not signed by the President of the concerned union as required under the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules and that the office bearers of the union were not authorised by a resolution of the Executive Committee to raise the instant dispute, which has not been espoused by a substantial majority of workmen of the respondent establishment?

On merits.

(1) Whether the employees employed in the Fire Fighting Service at Beas Dam Project, Talwara, District Hoshiarpur, are entitled to the payment of Call Allowance from 1st June, 1965 to 31st December, 1969 at the same rate at which such an allowance has been paid to them with effect from 1st January, 1970?

(2) Issue No. (1) is decided against the workmen, are they entitled to any other relief and if so, with what details?

(3) Relief.

No evidence in regard to preliminary issue was produced in this case. There were some other References No. 7/C, 8/C, 9/C and 14/C of 1973, raising different disputes and one Reference No. 11/C of 1973 relates to the Fire-fighting staff though the dispute raised therein is about revision of their scales of wages. The preliminary issues in all the cases are the same and by an order dated 14-3-1974 passed in Reference No. 11/C of 1973, it was, on agreement between the parties decided that in all the aforesaid References so far as they related to the decision of the preliminary issue be consolidated. Some evidence was therefore recorded in Reference No. 11/C of 1973 and it is that evidence that will have to be referred, to dispose of the preliminary issue. The management produced Shri Babu Lal, Clerk, office of the Asst. Labour Commissioner (Central), Chandigarh who produced only a copy of the demand notice and joint application for Reference. Shri O. P. Saxena, Asstt. Labour Commissioner (Central) was examined as R.W.2 and it was deposed by him that no copy of the resolution of the Executive Committee of the Union purporting to be authorising Shri Daulat Singh Chohan to serve the instant demand notice was produced during conciliation proceedings nor any letter of authority in form 'F'. Shri Sudarshan Kumar, Record-keeper in the office of the General Manager, Beas Project, Talwara, appeared as R.W.3 and admitted that demand notice was received in the office. This evidence does not carry us anywhere to substantiate the preliminary objections. As a matter of fact, the preliminary issues were not pressed seriously as observed by me in my award in Reference No. 8/C of 1973 and I reiterate the same observations. It was the duty of the management to have led any further evidence if they so desired but no attempt was made in this regard. It is not disputed that it was on joint application that the Reference in question was made and if the management did not accept the authority of the union or it believed that the workmen were not supporting the cause it would not have agreed to the Reference or at least it would have raised the question before the Conciliation Officer. No objection was ever raised that the President of the Union did not sign the joint application and if the authority to sign was lacking the management should not have agreed to the joint reference or the application Ext. R/2. There is in my opinion no substance in the preliminary issue and the objections raised are frivolous.

As regards merits the evidence of the workmen is insufficient to create any impact in respect of claim set up by them. The only witness examined on their behalf is Shri Daulat Singh Chohan, General Secretary of the Union who

appeared as W.W.I. According to this witness, the members of the Fire-fighting are on duty almost 24 hours since they are not working in shifts any longer. It is in his evidence that at one time the Fire staff wanted the over-time allowance for 16 hours of extra work since the normal permissible period of daily work is 8 hours and that in view of such staff remaining ready for an emergency call all the 24 hours a Call Allowance @ Rs. 25/- per month to Firemen and Rs. 30/- per month to the higher staff w.e.f. 1-1-1970 is being paid. This witness does not say anything as to how the shifts were working and why he wants this Tribunal to believe that the Fire staff are on duty almost 24 hours. It is true that they should be available in case of emergency and that is why Call Allowance is being paid to them. He does not even depose when the shifts started and when they were abolished. It is also not clear how the change in shift system has affected the volume of work of the fire-fighting staff or increased their working hours. The burden was on the workmen to produce all necessary data and they have miserably failed in this regard. Date for claiming the Call Allowance from 1st June, 1965 has been chosen by the workmen as they joined the Fire staff on that date. It is not known what were their conditions of service at that time and having taken up service as a member of fire-staff in 1965 with their eyes open and on the terms and conditions as offered to them than how can they by reason of any subsequent developments, if any, claim extra benefit from the very date of joining the service. Shri B. D. Aggarwal, S.D.O. Personnel, M.W.I. has stated on S.A. that firemen has to perform duty for 8 hours like other workmen. Every member of the fire-staff attends to telephone calls by rotation in 24 hours but that does not increase the number of working hours. These workmen have been provided residential quarters close to the Fire Station so that they can make themselves available when necessary. They can even be absent from the quarters by informing the Fire Officer. The very object of Call Allowance is to give benefit for such contingencies and they are getting the same with effect from 1-1-1970. No case for back dues is made out and the same is rejected.

There is no order as to costs.

16-8-1974

H. R. SODHI, Presiding Officer.

[No.L.42012/22/73/LRIII]

G. C. SAKSENA, Under Secy.

S.O. 2715.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of Industrial Tribunal, Madras, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Madras Port Trust, Madras, and their workman represented by the Port and Dock Labour Union, Madras, which was received by the Central Government on the 24th September, 1974.

BFFORE THIRU T. PALANIAPPAN, B.A., B.L.,

PRESIDING OFFICER,

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, MADRAS

(Constituted by the Central Government)

Saturday, the 7th day of September, 1974

Industrial Dispute No. 17 of 1974

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, between the workmen and the Management of Madras Port Trust, Madras).

BETWEEN

The Workmen represented by—

The President, Port and Dock Labour Union, No. 205, Linebi Chetti Street, Madras-1.

AND

The Chairman, Madras Port Trust, Madras-1

82GI/74—5

Reference :

Order No. L. 33011/11/73-P & D dated 14-3-1974 of the Ministry of Labour, Government of India, New Delhi.

This dispute coming on for final hearing on Friday the 30th day of August, 1974 upon perusing the reference, claim and counter statements and all other material papers on record and upon hearing the arguments of Thiru R. Ramathan, President of the Union and of Thiru V. T. Arasan for Thiruvallargal R. G. Rajan and D. V. Sivagnanam, Advocates for the management and having stood over till this day for consideration, this Tribunal made the following :

AWARD

This is a reference by the Central Government relating to an industrial dispute between the workers and the management of the Madras Port Trust in respect of the issue set out below.

2. It is as follows :—

"Whether the action of the Madras Port Trust, in re-employment of Shri P. Jacob, as casual Mazdoor from 19th May, 1972 over-looking his seniors, namely M/s. Ganesan, T. Sarangan, K. Dorai, D. Sundaramurthy, M. Arumugam, S. Perumal and M. R. Siva, is justified? If not, to what relief the said senior mazdoors are entitled and from what date?"

3. The President of the Port and Dock Labour Union has filed a claim statement stating that the workers Thiruvallargal Ganesan, T. Sarangan, K. Dorai, D. Sundaramurthy, M. Arumugam, S. Perumal and M. R. Siva and three other workers, namely, C. Nathan, K. Shanmugam and Velayudam have worked for more than 240 days during the last 12 months, and as these workers have worked for more than 240 days in the Industry, they have completed one year of continuous service in the Industry as per Section 25(B) of the Industrial Disputes Act and as such they are entitled to a month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for the discharge. But no such notice was given to the workers, and on this ground alone the discharge of the workers is illegal. The respondent introduced decasualisation scheme with effect from 16-9-1971. The alleged settlement by the management with one of the trade unions functioning in the Madras Port Trust is not binding on the workers concerned in the dispute because they are not members of that union. It is further stated that the worker Thiru P. Jacob, a casual mazdoor was not in the services on the date when decasualisation scheme was introduced and was discharged from service on 22-5-1969 and was reinstated on 19-5-1972, and as he was not in service on 16-9-1971 the action of the management in taking him into the common pool on 19-5-1972 is a gross violation of the settlement alleged to have been reached between the respondent and the Madras Port Trust Employees Union. The respondent refused to include the 7 workers concerned in this reference in the common pool. Under those circumstances the non-employment of the 7 workers is wrongful and illegal for the following reasons: (1) the workers were discharged without any notice and (2) they were not given a month's notice, (3) failed to follow the procedure laid down in the Industrial Disputes Act, (4) the re-employment of Thiru P. Jacob over-looking the seniors and (5) violation of the principles of natural justice. Under those circumstances the union contends that the discharge of the workers from service and the refusal to re-employ the workers is unjustified.

4. The respondent has filed a counter affidavit contending as follows: The reference is not maintainable at all. The casual mazdoors referred to in this dispute were appointed purely on temporary basis in connection with repairs carried out in the midjet dredger and hence the said reference is liable to be dismissed in limine. The respondent also contends that the order of reference takes for granted that the mazdoors referred in the claim statement are seniors to Jacob, which is not correct. The casual mazdoors referred to in the notice under reference were given intermittent breaks for want of work and finally discharged with effect from 10-4-1973 on completion of the work; that as per the procedure, they were given 24 hours notice before discharge as was done in respect of discharge of other casual labourers. The respondent denies the allegation that these 7 workers were

in continuous service as alleged by them. The settlement entered into with the Madras Port Trust Employees Union is valid and binding on the petitioners as per para 18 of the memorandum of settlement, it was agreed not to consider any one under this scheme of decasualisation other than those who are in service on the date of decasualisation. As the casual mazdoors were not in service at the relevant time, the question of inclusion of their names in the labour pool does not arise. So far as the reinstatement of Thiru Jacob, casual mazdoor is concerned it was agreed as per the memorandum of settlement dated 13-5-1972 to rescind the order of discharge dated 20-6-1969 passed against him and reinstate him with effect from 17-5-1972.

5. Issue :—Thuri C. Ramachandran, W.W. 1 has given evidence to the effect that he knows Jacob, mazdoor worker in the Port Trust and that he joined in the Port Trust as a fitter in 1965; that in 1969, he was discharged from service after disciplinary action; that he was again taken for service in 1972; that decasualisation started in 1971 and when it was given effect to Thiru Jacob was not in service; that Jacob was again taken in as mazdoor. In the course of the cross-examination he deposed that he knows personally as to when the mazdoors working in the Port Trust joined and when they were discharged. It is highly improbable to say as to when exactly the 2000 persons working in the Port Trust joined the service and also when and who were all discharged. But this witness is unable to say in which union Thiru Jacob was a member. A suggestion was made to show that because Thiru Jacob is not a member in the union to which the witness belonged he has come forward to given evidence against him. This suggestion must be true because of the evasive answer given by him to the effect that he did not know in which union Jacob was a member. In my opinion his evidence is not in way useful for deciding the point at issue.

6. In the reference it is stated that the mazdoors, namely Shri Ganesan, T. Sarangan, K. Dorai, D. Sundaramurthy, M. Arumugam, S. Perumal and M. R. Siva are seniors to Thiru P. Jacob. The respondent does not concede the fact that the 7 workers are seniors to Thiru Jacob. The question for consideration is whether the re-employment of Thiru P. Jacob as casual mazdoor from 19th May, 1972 is justified and whether Thiruvalargal Ganesan, T. Sarangan, K. Dorai, D. Sundaramurthy, M. Arumugam, S. Perumal and M. R. Siva can question the appointment alleging seniority. The case of the respondent is that the 7 workers were only casual mazdoors and their appointment was purely temporary in nature. There is no evidence contra on the side of the workers. Further W.W. 1 Thiru C. Ramachandran has not given evidence, namely, that the 7 workers were not casual mazdoors. But, on the other hand, the respondent has stated in the counter affidavit, the service particulars of each of the 7 workers mentioned in the order of reference and others. No materials were placed to contradict these particulars. Hence it can be safely concluded that the 7 workers mentioned in the order of reference were casual mazdoors and thus employment was temporary in nature. It is also the case of the respondent that those casual mazdoors would be given 24 hours notice before discharge. Thus it has been conclusively established that the 7 workers alleged to be the seniors to Jacob were only the casual mazdoors and as such they are not entitled to put forward the case, namely, that they are workmen as contemplated in the Industrial Disputes Act and that they should have been given a month's notice before discharge. Under those circumstances the seven workers cannot claim that they are seniors to Thiru Jacob.

7. Ex. M-2 is the copy of the memorandum of settlement between the Madras Port Trust Employees Union and the management, namely, Port Trust. It is dated 27th July, 1971. As per the terms of this settlement decasualisation was introduced and para 18 of this agreement reads as follows :—

“As a result of the above, the total number of men who will not be absorbed in monthly paid posts will be about 623 including 39 ex-casuals who are already in monthly paid posts. Taking into account this circumstance also, it is not possible for the Administration to consider any one under this decasualisation scheme other than those in current employment. However, these men who cannot be absorbed in monthly paid posts will be formed into

a labour pool, details relating to which are dealt with below.”

It is the positive case of the management that the 7 workers referred to in the order of reference were not in service on the date of Ex. M-2 and hence the question of inclusion of the labour pool does not arise for consideration. There is no evidence to contradict the case and the union has not filed any document to show that on the date of the decasualisation as per the terms of agreement Ex. M-2, Thiruvalargal Ganesan, T. Sarangan, K. Dorai, D. Sundaramurthy, M. Arunugam, S. Perumal and M. R. Siva were on the rolls of the Port Trust. The Port Trust pressed into service, another agreement Ex. M-1 dated 13th May, 1972. It was an agreement entered into between Madras Port Trust and Sri S.C.C. Anthoni Pillai, President, Madras Port Trust Employees Union. As per this agreement, the Madras Port Trust agreed without creating a precedent, to rescind the order of discharge dated 20th May, 1969 and re-instate Thiru P. Jacob with effect from 17th May, 1972 as a daily rated mazdoor in the casual labour pool formed under the settlement between the parties dated 27th July, 1971 (original of Ex. M-2) with full continuity of service. As per this agreement Thiru Jacob was not entitled to any pay or wages for the period of non-employment and was given the seniority rating and eligibility to absorption in or promotion to the post of Fitter. In view of the fact that the 7 workers alleged to be seniors were not on the rolls on the date of introduction of the de-casualisation scheme under the original of Ex. M-2 and also as Thiru Jacob was taken under the agreement (original of Ex. M-1), the 7 workers are not entitled to put forward the plea that they are seniors to Thiru P. Jacob. In view of my discussion above I find this issue against the petitioner Union.

9. In the result an award is passed holding that the re-employment of Sri P. Jacob is justified and the mazdoors seven in number referred to in the order of reference are not entitled to any relief. There will be no order as to costs.

Dated this 7th day of September, 1974.

WITNESSES EXAMINED

For workmen—W.W. 1—Thiru C. Ramachandran.
For management : Nil.

DOCUMENT MARKED :—For workmen—W1/11-10-73—
Conciliation failure report.

For management :

M-1/13-5-72—Memorandum of settlement u/s 2(p) of the I.D. Act, 1947 between the Madras Port Trust & the workmen represented by Madras Port Trust Employees' Union. (copy)

M-2/27-7-71—Memorandum of settlement between the Madras Port Trust and the Madras Port Trust Employees' Union. (copy)

Sd/-
Industrial Tribunal.

Note : Parties are directed to take return of their documents within six months from the date of the award

Sd/-

Head Ministerial Officer.
Office of the Industrial Tribunal.
Madras.

[No. L-33011/11/73-P&D/MT]

S.O. 2716.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Beas Dam Project, Talwara and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 23rd September, 1974

BEFORE SHRI H. R. SODHI, PRESIDING OFFICER,
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CENTRAL,
CHANDIGARH.

Reference No. 11/C of 1973.
BETWEEN

The workmen and the management of Beas Dam Project,
Talwara,

Appearance :

Shri K. K. Jaagia and Shri Padamjit Singh—for the respondent project.

Shri Daulat Singh Chohan—for the workmen.

AWARD

The Fire Fighting staff empowered by the respondent management at Beas Dam Project, Talwara were dissatisfied with their existing pay scales and raised a dispute in this regard claiming the scale of pay to be raised to Rs. 110-200. Conciliation proceedings failed to resolve the dispute amicably and the workmen represented through then Union known as workers Union, Beas Dam Project, Talwara, jointly with the management made an application Ext. R/2, under Section 10(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act for referring their dispute to a Tribunal. Shri Daulat Singh appended his signatures to this application as General Secretary of the Union whereas the Executive Engineer Personnel Division and the Personnel Officer both signed on behalf of the management. The Central Government then being satisfied that the workers Union represented the majority of the workmen raising the dispute acted in exercise of the powers conferred on it by Section 7-A read with sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act and referred as per Notification No. L. 42012/23/73/LRIII, dated 29-5-1973, published in the Gazette of India the following matter to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

Whether the Fire Fighting men employed at Beas Dam Project, Talwara are entitled to the scale of Rs. 110-200? If so, from what date?

Claim statement was filed on behalf of the workmen who pleaded that Firemen of 'B' Class stations in Punjab get a pay scale of Rs. 110-4-130/5-160/-200 whereas the firemen of the Beas Dam project who are agitating the matter are in the pay scale of only Rs. 60-4-100 and that too w.e.f. 1-1-1970. In support of their claim they appended with the claim statement letters from the officials of Municipal Committees of Amritsar, Ludhiana and Jullundur. The management resisted the claim. It raised some preliminary objections as well and pleaded that the grade of pay of Fire Fighting staff was revised w.e.f. 1-1-1970 and the revised pay scale is Rs. 100-4-140/5-160 though earlier to that the grade was Rs. 60-4-100. It is further availed by the management that there is no parity between the Firemen of the respondent Project and those employed by the Municipal Committees all of which are 'A' Class Committees. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed :—

Preliminary issue :

Whether the instant reference is bad in law and without jurisdiction for the preliminary objections stated in paras 1 to 3 of the written statement, wherein the reasons alleged are that the application and statement were not signed by the President of the union as required under the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and that the office bearers of the union were not authorised by any resolution of the Executive Committee to raise the present dispute and that the reference is vague."

On merits :

(1) Whether the Fire Fighting men employed at Beas Dam Project, Talwara are entitled to the scale of Rs. 110-200 and, if so, from what date?

(2) Relief.

There were some other References as well namely No. 7/C of 1973, 8/C of 1973, 9/C of 1973 and 14/C of 1973 raising different dispute and one Reference No. 10/C of 1973 relates to the Fire Fighting Staff though the dispute raised therein is different. The preliminary issues in all the cases

are the same but by an order dated 14-3-1974 evidence was recorded in the present case only it being agreed between all the parties that so far as preliminary issues were concerned proceedings in all the References be consolidated. The management produced Shri Babu Lal, clerk, office of the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (Central), Chandigarh, R. W. 1, who produced a copy of the demand notice and joint application for Reference. Shri O. P. Saxena, Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) was examined as R. W. 2 and it was deposed by him that no copy of the resolution of the Executive Committee of the Union purporting to be authorising Shri Daulat Singh Chohan to serve the instant demand notice was produced during conciliation proceedings nor any letter of authority in form 'F'. Shri Sudarshan Kumar, Record-keeper in the office of the General Manager, Beas Project, Talwara, appeared as R. W. 3 and admitted that demand notice was received in the office. This evidence does not carry us anywhere to substantiate the preliminary objections. As a matter of fact, the preliminary issues were not pressed seriously as observed by me in my award in Reference No. 8/C of 1973 and I reiterate the same observations. It was the duty of the management to have led any further evidence if they so desired but no attempt was made in this regard. It is not disputed that it was on joint application that the Reference in question was made and if the management did not accept the authority of the union or it believed that the workmen were not supporting the cause it would not have agreed to the Reference or at least it would have raised the question before the Conciliation Officer. No objection was ever raised that the President of the Union did not sign the joint application and if the authority to sign was lacking the management should not have agreed to the joint reference on the application Ext. R/2. There is in my opinion no substance in the preliminary issue and the objections raised are frivolous.

On merits.—I have given my careful thought to the matter and am satisfied that the claim of the Fire Fighting staff for revision of their pay scales is justified. It is not disputed that the pay scales of all the employees including the Fire Brigade staff were revised w.e.f. 1-1-1970. Shri Sadhu Ram, Sub-Fire Officer of the respondent establishment appeared as A. W. 1 and stated that except the firemen all other categories of workmen who were earlier at par with them or were getting even lower pay scales have been given higher pay scales as a result of revision in 1970. From his personal knowledge he has deposed that pay scales of Silt Observers, Store-keepers, Metre Readers and Telephone Operators used to be Rs. 50-3-80/4-100 and by revision in 1970 they were increased to Rs. 110-4-130/5-160/5-200. This statement of Shri Sadhu Ram is not challenged by the management either by cross-examining the witness or by leading any evidence in rebuttal though Shri B. D. Aggarwal, Sub-Divisional Officer Personnel was produced afterwards as R. W. 5. This witness places Firemen in a category of their own and made an attempt to distinguish their case from those employees whose pay grades have been referred to above in the statement of Shri Sadhu Ram, A. W. 1. I cannot put much faith in the statement of Shri Aggarwal, R. W. 5 from whose demeanour I was compelled to make a note while recording his evidence that he was hesitating and avoiding straight forward replies. He even would not admit the Schedule of wages a cyclostyled copy of which was shown to him by the workmen in his cross-examination. No doubt this Schedule is not signed by any one but it was supplied to the union as per letter Ext. A/1 issued by the Executive Engineer Personnel. Shri Aggarwal is Sub-Divisional Officer Personnel and it is difficult to believe that dealing with the Personnel branch he could not by reading the Schedule marked 'B' say whether it broadly contained correct statements. The whole statement of this witness did not inspire confidence. Be that as it may, he has not contradicted Shri Sadhu Ram that the revision of pay scales in 1970 effected all others more beneficially than the Fire Fighting staff. Shri Balbir Singh, A. W. 3, is working as a Fire-fighting man with the respondent establishment for the last 10 years. He was recruited directly on a pay scale of Rs. 60-4-100 and the same was revised afterwards in 1970 to Rs. 100-4-140/5-160. He also reiterates that it is the Fire Fighting staff who have been discriminated and have not been put at par with other employees of the respondent who were drawing before revision in 1970 the same pay scales or even lower. The matter of revision of pay scales of the workmen of Beas Sutlej Link, Sundernagar which is another link of the same Organisation came up before this Tribunal in Reference No.

2/C of 1971. It had been directed there that one of the broad principles that should be adopted by the management in revising the pay scales of its employees should be amalgamation of the initial basic pay and dearness pay and that if the amalgamated amount came to Rs. 100/- or less, a sum of Rs. 10/- should be added by way of increase thereby making the basic pay to start with Rs. 110/- and this is just the demand of the workmen in the instant case. I feel that the claim of the workmen is very just and there is no reason to put them in a separate category simply because they are paid Call Allowance of Rs. 25/- or Rs. 30/- per month. The Fire Fighting men used to work initially in shifts but that system has now been dropped as I have noticed in a connected Reference No. 10/C of 1973 where the demand is different though raised by this very class of employees. The Call Allowance was started in 1970 after shift system had been abandoned and this Call Allowance is entirely for different purpose. The Fire Fighting men are required to be available at any time in all the 24 hours of the day and residential quarters close to the Fire Station have been provided to them. It is this obligation to remain always ready for duty throughout 24 hours of the day that necessitated the payment of the Call Allowance and it is wholly un-related to the question of wages. I, therefore, direct that the pay scales of the Fire Fighting men will be revised to Rs. 110-4-130/5-160/5-200 and the benefit of this revision will be given to them w.e.f. 1-2-1968 as has been done in the case of employees of Beas Sutlej Link, Sundernagar following the pattern laid down by the Punjab Government. The reference stands answered accordingly with no orders as to costs.

16-8-1974

H. R. SODHI, Presiding Officer
[No. L. 42012/23/73/LR III]
G. C. SAKSENA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 5th October, 1974

S.O. 2717.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Moonidih Project of National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post Office Moonidih, District Dhanbad and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 26th September, 1974.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD

Reference No. 7 of 1973

In the matter of an industrial dispute u/s 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1974.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Moonidih Project of National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post office Moonidih, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the employers : Shri T. P. Choudhury, Advocate.

On behalf of the workmen: Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

State : Bihar.

Industry : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 19th September, 1974

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Rehabilitation in the department of Labour & Employment being of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the

employers in relation to the management of Moonidih Project of National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post office Moonidih, District Dhanbad and their workmen by their No. L/2012/68/72-LR II dated 24th January, 1973 referred the same u/s 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act to this Tribunal for adjudication on the issue as mentioned in the schedule below:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Moonidih Project of Messrs National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post office Moonidih, District Dhanbad, in dismissing Shri D. P. Mishra, Compressor Operator from service with effect from the 29th November, 1971 is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workmen entitled?"

The case of the employers is that at 3 A.M. on 25-2-1971 Kaileshwar Singh a mining sirdar died inside the mine as a result of an accident. The workers of the first shift on that date refused to go down the mine and collected at the pit top very much excited. They demanded paid holiday payment of compensation of Rs. 500/- to the family of the deceased. They also demanded that the Asstt. Manager, Mr. H. V. Solanki be suspended and the Project officer, Shri S. P. Mathur be transferred. All reasoning with the workmen failed. Among others the concerned workman, Shri D. P. Mishra led the mob with indulged in slogan shouting. The mob broke open the door of the pit top office in which Shri Mathur and Shri Solanki had taken shelter. Shri Solanki was assaulted by a number of persons. The concerned workman Shri Mishra instigated the workmen not to go to work and actually in the first shift the workmen had struck work. In the second shift the concerned workman had no duty but still then he came to the mine and instigated the workmen not to work. In the second shift also the workmen had struck work. The management after the strike in the first shift had issued notice pointing out that the stoppage of work by the workmen constituted an illegal strike. Shri Mishra was served with a charge sheet among others alleging that he had taken part in the illegal strike in the first shift caused wilful damage to the work in progress of the project, incited the second shift workmen not to go to work and continued the illegal strike and thus committed breach of Regulation 36 of Coal Mines Regulation. Shri S. K. Choudhury, Deputy Superintendent of Collieries, Sudamdih was appointed as an enquiry officer and he held enquiry into the charges against Shri D. P. Mishra and other workmen. In the enquiry Shri Mishra was afforded all opportunities to defend his case. The enquiry officer after completion of the enquiry submitted his report holding Shri Mishra guilty of the charges levelled against him and the management on acceptance of the findings ordered dismissal of Shri D. P. Mishra w.e.f. 29-11-1971. The case of the workmen is one of entire denial of the charges levelled against Shri D. P. Mishra. Their case is that Shri Mishra was in his duty in the compressor room in the first shift on 25-2-1971 and after completion of his duty he had gone home. He had no manner of connection with the troubles that occurred in the colliery following the death of Shri Kaileshwar Singh, a mining sirdar. It is alleged that the enquiry was a perfunctory one, the enquiry officer was biased against the concerned workman. He did not allow the concerned workman either to searchingly cross-examine the prosecution witness or to produce his own witness and he was denied his proper defence. The action of the management in dismissing the concerned workman is alleged to be unjustified, wrongful, mala fide in violation of the principles of natural justice, amounting to victimisation and unfair labour practice.

3. During the pendency of the adjudication proceedings in this Tribunal an application was filed from the side of the management relying upon the domestic enquiry and asking the Tribunal to try the validity of the domestic enquiry as a preliminary issue and to allow them an opportunity to adduce evidence on merit if the findings on the preliminary issue are against them. It is by now a settled law that when the dismissal of an employee is based on the findings of a domestic enquiry the aggrieved party may rely upon the domestic enquiry in the first instance to prove the validity of the enquiry. Accordingly the prayer of the

management in this respect was allowed. I shall therefore confine my consideration to the validity or otherwise of the domestic enquiry. It is submitted by the learned Advocate representing the workmen that the charge as framed against the concerned workman is defective in that there is no mention of facts relating to the instigation with which the concerned workman has been charged. I have looked into the chargesheet, Ext M1 together with the statement of allegations which forms part of it. In head I of the charge Shri D. P. Mishra is alleged to have incited the workers of Moonidih project in the first shift of 25-2-1971 to have recourse to illegal strike and also abetted that act so much that the workers had resorted to illegal strike and Shri Mishra also participated in the strike. In head II the charge is that Shri Mishra caused wilful damage to work in progress of Moonidih Project in the first shift of 25-2-1971 or abetted such act and in head III of the charge he is alleged to have instigated the second shift workers not to go to work in spite of notice of the management about the strike being illegal and he is said to have committed a breach of Regulation 38 of Coal Mines Regulation by entering the premises of the project outside his working hours. In the statement of allegations details have been incorporated and those two taken together make the charge quite clear and understandable to the workman concerned and I find no vagueness in the charge by which the concerned workman could have been prejudiced. In the written statement filed in this Tribunal by the workmen there is also no allegation that the charge was defective for any reason whatsoever. Then it appears that the concerned workman replied to the charge sheet and a domestic enquiry was held with notice to him in which he fully participated. He was assisted in the enquiry by a co-worker Shri Dilip Chakravorty. The management's witnesses were cross-examined and the concerned workman examined his witnesses also. The men concerned have all signed the pages of the enquiry proceedings. There is therefore nothing demonstrably wrong in holding the enquiry. It does not appear from the papers of the enquiry proceedings that any allegation was ever raised before the enquiry officer that Shri Mishra was not given full opportunity to defend his case or searchingly cross-examine the management's witnesses. I am satisfied from records that the concerned workman was given full opportunity to cross-examine the management's witnesses and to defend his own case. I will now deal with the specific objections raised before me by the learned Advocate representing the workman about the fairness of the enquiry. The management examined 5 witnesses of which 4 were mining engineers and one was labour officer. It is submitted that the Asstt. Manager, Shri Solanki and Labour Officer Shri Prasad submitted their prepared evidence before the enquiry officer. This, it is submitted, is contrary to law and both the above witnesses should have examined themselves in full. In this connection a reference is made to the decision in Supreme Court S. C. L. J. Vol. 2 page 1442 *Khardah Co. v. their workmen*. The Supreme Court in their decision has discouraged the idea of recording statement of witnesses ex parte and then producing witnesses for cross-examination after serving copy of such a previously recorded statement. According to the enquiry officer examined as MW 1, he supplied copies of the prepared evidence of the above two witnesses to the concerned workman who was also allowed opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses on the prepared evidence submitted before the enquiry officer. The present case stands almost on the same footing as the case in the Supreme Court as referred to above. For obvious reasons the statement of the two witnesses should have been recorded by the enquiry officer himself instead of accepting the prepared statement of the witnesses. It is likely to cause prejudice to the delinquent. The best that I can do in such circumstances is to scrap the evidence of Shri Solanki and Shri Prasad. That does not vitiate the whole enquiry. There were 3 other witnesses examined by the management and if Shri Solanki and Shri Prasad's were the only evidence in this case this would have been otherwise. It remains to be seen if the findings of the enquiry officer are supported by the evidence of the remaining witnesses. The next objection raised by the learned Advocate representing the workmen is that after the examination of Shri Mathur was over in the domestic enquiry some documents were produced by him which caused prejudice to the concerned workman. It appears from the enquiry proceedings that during cross-examination of Shri S. P. Mathur he was requested by the enquiry officer to submit all the details of

the medical help rendered by NCDC Medical centres on Shri Solanki and Shri Mathur on 26-4-1971. The enquiry officer also requested for a copy of the police report filed on 26-4-1971. On the next sitting i.e. on 27-4-1971 Shri Mathur submitted as desired by the enquiry officer police report, notice on the workmen on 25-2-1971 in 2nd and 3rd shift and medical reports. It was not that the management themselves filed these documents of their own but being required by the enquiry officer these documents were filed. Of the documents filed the police report is only a matter of fact. The notices in the 2nd and 3rd shift are also matters of fact directing the workmen to resume duties otherwise their absence from duty will be considered as resorting to strike. The above two documents are such that either produced before the examination of management's witnesses or after examination of the management's witnesses they do not make much difference, in that they do not cause any prejudice to the workman's defence. It is not denied that no notice on the workmen was issued on the 2nd and 3rd shift of 25-2-71. Then comes the medical report. The medical report was in connection with the injuries received by Shri Solanki and Shri Mathur as a result of assault on them by the workmen. This medical report also does not cause any prejudice to the concerned workman inasmuch as he is not charged with assault on Shri Solanki and Shri Mathur. Some of the delinquents and some of the defence witnesses admitted that Shri Solanki and Shri Mathur received injuries and defence witness No. 7 says that Shri Solanki received treatment for 20 days. So medical report was not also a document which should have of necessity, been filed before the examination of management's witnesses. It will therefore appear that this objection has practically no substance. The next objection raised before me is that after the close of the management witnesses on 18-5-1971 the management filed 3 documents which are (1) Form C register from 17-1-71 to 27-2-71 showing that Shri Tribeni Singh Choudhury and Shri Dilip Chakravorty got their names entered in the register on 25-2-71 (2) report book of surveyor for 280 and 220 M Horizon to draw the attention regarding the work on 25-2-1971 and (3) overman's register for 400 and 500 Horizon to show regarding work on 25-2-71. These documents were no doubt relied upon by the enquiry officer in respect of the relevant delinquents. All these registers are maintained under the provisions of the statutes. In other words these registers are statutory registers maintained in the ordinary course of business. Accordingly the correctness of these registers can be presumed. Nothing has been stated as to how these documents are wrong. These registers go to show that no work was done in the mine on 25-2-71. It is perhaps not the case of the workmen that work was done alight in all the shifts on 25-2-71 nor the concerned workman has given satisfactory evidence before the enquiry officer that there was no interruption of work in any shift on 25-2-71. The nature of the statutory registers being as it is they do not cause any prejudice to the workmen having been filed after the close of the management's evidence. The purpose which these statutory registers serve is also served by other evidence on record and even if for arguments sake these statutory registers were kept out of consideration it makes no difference. I will discuss later about the absence of the workmen from duty from other available evidence before the enquiry officer. I will now deal with the alleged biasness of the enquiry officer victimisation of the concerned workman, unfair labour practice and malafides on the part of the management. Vague charge of biasness on the part of the enquiry officer does not serve the purpose. It must be shown that the part of the enquiry officer was such as to create a real likelihood of biasness in the mind of a reasonable man. In other words it must be shown that the role of the enquiry officer was such that there was substantial possibility or bias on his part. This is what is held in 1973 II I J 473 S.C.—*S. Parathaswarthi v. State of Andhra Pradesh*. The enquiry officer MW 1 is a Sub-Area Manager Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. He was an employee of NCDC at the relevant time. He was posted at Sudamdih project as opposed to the Moonidih project where the incident took place. His evidence is that he had nothing to do with the incident. He was a technical officer at that time as a technical officer. He did not know Shri D. P. Mishra before the enquiry and he had also no knowledge that he was an active member of the union. He denies that he was pressurised by the General Manager to accept the evidence of the management's witnesses without proper

consideration. I fail to find out from the evidence coming from the side of the concerned workman in the domestic enquiry that there was any real likelihood of biasness on the part of the enquiry officer against the concerned workman. On the point of victimisation it is submitted by the learned Advocate representing the workmen before me that Shri S. P. Mathur was all along opposed to the concerned workman and in previous time he tried to implicate him in some cases and he also approached the police with a petition u/s 107 Cr. P. C. against the concerned workman and others. WW. 1 Shri Bunkim Chandra Pandey says in the cross examination that the application u/s 107 Cr. P. C. was filed in order to avoid breach of peace in connection with some incident. There is also nothing to show that Shri Mathur in any way prevailed upon the enquiry officer in respect of his findings. In this connection it is alleged that Shri Dilip Chakravorty, N. C. Chatterjee, A. K. Saha and S. N. Banerjee were also involved in the matter and charge sheets were issued to them but as they belong to a rival union which is in the good book of the company no enquiry was held against them. The case of the management appears to be that Shri Dilip Chakravorty and Shri S. N. Banerjee belong to colliery accounts and Shri A. K. Saha and Shri N. C. Chatterjee belong to Ranchi cadre and enquiry against these 4 persons is pending in Ranchi. WW. 1 being questioned in this respect says that he does not know if enquiry was held against the above 4 persons. The concerned workman Shri D. P. Mishra examined as WW. 2 says in the cross-examination that he has no knowledge if any enquiry was held against Shri Dilip Chakravorty and others at Ranchi level. The workmen have not adduced satisfactory evidence to show that no action was taken or is being taken against Shri Dilip Chakravorty and others as they happen to belong to another union. Materials before me are not adequate to hold that the concerned workman has been victim of victimisation by the management. The workmen have not also produced sufficient materials for me to hold that the management is guilty of unfair labour practice. The ultimate question therefore remains that if the findings of the enquiry officer are perverse i.e. the findings are not supported by evidence. I leave aside evidence of Shri Solanki and Shri Prasad for reasons as already stated. Before the enquiry officer the concerned workman was confronted with the log book for the first shift of 25-2-71 and he appears to have admitted that no entries were made therein during the period 10 P. M. to 1 A. M. and there was only one entry at 3 P.M. under his signature. The first shift closes at 3 P.M. It is submitted that entries in the compressor log book with regard to the pressure and temperature were required to be made in every 15 minutes to one hour. It is not the case of the concerned workman that he made entries alright in the log book from 15 minutes to one hour. No explanation is also there about the absence of entries during the period. This log book is also kept in the ordinary course of business and there is a presumption of correctness of the same. The log book therefore points to the absence of the concerned workman from duty in the first shift. The supervisor note book and the overmans note book which are statutory registers also show that no work was done in the mine on 25-2-71. No sufficient evidence was adduced before the enquiry officer by the concerned workman that he was on duty in the compressor room in the first shift on 25-2-71. Management's witness Shri S. P. Mathur, Shri A. G. Watwe and Shri H. N. Singh have all seen the concerned workman in the mob. It is very clear from the materials on record that on all the shifts on 25-2-71 the workmen in general struck work including the concerned workman. Admittedly in the relevant time the coal industry was declared as 'Public Utility Service' in which no strike could be resorted to without proper notice u/s 22 of the I.D. Act. It is in the evidence of Shri S. P. Mathur that in the first shift on 25-2-71 Shri D. P. Mishra along with a few others were playing a leading role. He among others demanded a paid holiday and compensation award of Rs. 500/- to the family of the workman who died as a result of the accident centering which fact the trouble arose. It is also in his evidence that Shri Mishra raised slogans and the mob got excited whereafter the mob invaded pit top office and assaulted Shri Solanki and also caused injury to Shri S. P. Mathur. The concerned workman demanded that Shri Solanki should be suspended and Shri Mathur should be transferred. He especially incited the workers not to go to work. Then his evidence is that in the 2nd shift Shri Mishra was not on duty. But he came to the mine and instigated the workers. Then the evidence of

Shri A. G. Watwe is that Shri Dilip Chakravorty and some others stopped the Asstt. Manager and the surveyor going down to the mine. He saw Shri D. P. Mishra in the 2nd shift to strike work. The evidence of Shri H. N. Singh is that Shri Mishra raised slogans inside the crowd. He heard Shri Mishra saying "SOLANKI KO HATAO" one man had already died and it does not matter even if another man dies, the workers would take revenge. He saw Shri Mishra instigating workers to strike work. It is submitted that no reliance should be placed on the evidence of these three witnesses as they are all opposed to Shri D. P. Mishra. It is very much evident that those three officers presented themselves at the spot to quell the trouble. Admittedly when Shri Mathur and Shri Solanki received injuries as a result of assault in the hand of the workmen there can be no doubt about it that they were present on the spot. The management witnesses especially the first three, MW. 1, MW. 2 and MW. 3 were competent persons to depose before the enquiry officer as to what was what on 25-2-71 in the mine. I have no material before me to disbelieve them and discard their evidence. The enquiry officer has taken a possible view of the evidence on record and his findings are supported by evidence. I see no reason to interfere with this finding. I find that there was a proper and fair enquiry held and the principles of natural justice were duly observed. The enquiry is not vitiated by biasness of the enquiry officer, victimisation or unfair labour practice on the part of the management. The findings of the enquiry officer are also not perverse. Ordinarily the Tribunal was not entitled to interfere with the punishment awarded to a delinquent by the management on the basis of the findings of a domestic enquiry. The position has since changed with the coming into effect of S.11A of the I.D. Act from 15-12-71. The present industrial dispute was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication on 24-1-73 i.e. much after the coming into effect of the amendment of the I.D. Act. So the provisions of S. 11A of the Act can be invoked in the present case. When an industrial dispute has been referred to a Tribunal involving the dismissal or discharge of a workman the Tribunal is now clothed with the powers to reappraise the evidence in the domestic enquiry and satisfy itself if the misconduct has been established by evidence at the domestic enquiry. On such re-assessment of evidence the Tribunal may also hold that the misconduct has not been established on the evidence of the domestic enquiry and it may differ with the findings of the enquiry officer. The Tribunal may also hold in a given case that the misconduct is proved in a properly held domestic enquiry but the proved misconduct does not merit punishment by way of discharge or dismissal. It may under such circumstances award to the workman any lesser punishment instead. In other words, the power to interfere with the punishment and alter the same has now been conferred on the Tribunal by S. 11A of the Act in case where the employers have held a proper and valid domestic enquiry and where the Tribunal agrees with the findings of the enquiry officer. I have already stated that the misconduct of the concerned workman has been proved in a properly held domestic enquiry but for reasons to be just now stated I do not agree with the punishment awarded to the workman concerned. As a result of an accident a workman died in the mine. There was naturally a great commotion among the general body of workmen who got excited for some reasons or other on the spur of the moment. The proved misconduct against the concerned workman is that he participated in the illegal strike as almost all the workmen did. He incited the workmen not to go to work unless some demands were met by them, within his duty hours and outside his duty hours in the second shift. There is no charge against him of assault on the officers of the mine as some other workmen have, and there is also no charge against him breaking open the door of the pit top office as some other workmen have. In other words, there is no overt act alleged or proved against Shri D. P. Mishra. It is not also in evidence that he was a habitual 'offender' in the past. If participation in an illegal strike was criterion for dismissal then practically all the workmen should have been dismissed. But that it not the case. It appears from the enquiry proceedings that one Shri Tribeni Singh Choudhury whose misconduct was established on more counts than the concerned workman in this Reference did not get the punishment of dismissal. The charge of his abetting acts of violence on the officers of the company have been established against him. This is surely a grave charge. I do not mean that Shri Tribeni Singh should have received more severe punishment. What I am trying to drive at is that compared to Shri Tribeni Singh Choudhury the concerned

workman received more severe punishment in the hands of the management though the concerned workman does not appear to have surpassed Shri Tribeni Singh Choudhury in degree of his misconduct. I feel sympathy with Shri Solanki and Shri Mathur in respect of the injuries sustained by them in the hands of the unruly workmen for whom I have no manner of sympathy. Taking all facts and circumstances into consideration I am of the view that the proved misconduct of Shri D. P. Mishra does not warrant punishment by way of dismissal and a lesser punishment would meet the ends of justice.

In the circumstances of the case, the proved misconduct of Shri D. P. Mishra, the concerned workman does not merit punishment by way of dismissal from service. Accordingly the action of the management of Moonidih Project of

Messrs National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post office Moonidih, District Dhanbad, in dismissing Shri D. P. Mishra, Compressor Operator from service with effect from the 29th November 1971 is not justified to that extent. As a measure of punishment, the concerned workman be demoted to a suitable post in the next below category and he also forfeits his back wages uptill 31st December 1973. He does not also suffer any break in service. He be thus reinstated.

This is my award.

K. K. SARKAR, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-2012/68/72-LRII]

R. KUNJITHAPADAM, Under Secy.

